THE MOST BEAUTIFUL BOOK EVER WRITTEN

D. A. HAYES

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 6 1913
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division BS2595
.4.H41

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 6 1913
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE MOST BEAUTIFUL BOOK EVER WRITTEN

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE

BY
D. A. HAYES

Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Graduate School of Theology, Garrett Biblical Institute

NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & GRAHAM

Copyright, 1913, by
D. A. HAYES

TO

JAMES HAYES

A PHYSICIAN BELOVED BY MANY
HELPED IN BOTH BODY AND SOUL

CONTENTS

PART ONE: THE AUTHOR

	PAGE
I. The New Testament Data	3
II. The Name "Luke"	6
III. Luke, the Companion of Paul	12
IV. Luke, the Physician	19
V. Luke, the Musician	28
VI. Luke, the Artist	37
VII. Luke, the Gentile	40
VIII. Luke, of Antioch	42
IX. Luke, the Freedman	46
X. Luke in Later Tradition	49
XI. An Outline Biography	50

PART TWO: THE GOSPEL

I. Sources of the Gospel	57
II. Date of the Gospel	63
III. Place of Writing	66
IV. The Gospel for the Gentiles	68
V. The Gospel of an Educated Man	87
VI. The Gospel of the Physician	102
VII. The Gospel of Childhood	113
VIII. The Gospel of Womanhood	115
IX. The Gospel for the Poor	127
X. The Gospel for the Outcasts	142
XI. The Pauline Gospel	147
XII. The Gospel of Jesus, Our Brother-Man	160
XIII. The Gospel of Praise	176
XIV. The Gospel and the Man Luke	182

FOREWORD

LUKE is one of the most lovable characters in all church history. The Gospel according to Luke is one of the most attractive books in the world's literature. The truth of these two facts and the connection between them ought to be apparent in these pages.

Reader, have you thought that you knew the evangelist Luke? Look into these pages and see if there is not more in the man than you ever suspected. Have you thought you were acquainted with the Gospel according to Luke? Look through these pages and see whether there are not some beauties and some riches in it which you never had noticed. Then, if you come to love the man and the book a little more than you ever did before, we shall have our reward.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Introductions to the New Testament by Weiss, Moffatt, Dods, Bacon, Salmon, Adeney, Pullan, and others; The Books of the Bible; Book by Book; The Teachings of the Books; Farrar, The Messages of the Books; McClymont, The New Testament and Its Writers; Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. I; Weizsäcker, The Apostolic Age.

II. Commentaries on the Third Gospel by Plummer, in the International Critical Commentary series; Bruce, in the Expositor's Greek Testament series; Godet; Farrar, in the Cambridge Greek Testament series; Adeney, in the Century Bible; Garvie, in the Westminster New Testament; Burton, in the Expositor's Bible.

III. Special Studies by Selwyn, Luke the Prophet; Harnack, Luke the Physician; Ramsay, Saint Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, and, Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?; Hobart, The Medical Language of Saint Luke.

PART ONE: THE AUTHOR

THE AUTHOR

I. The New Testament Data

There are three synoptic Gospels: the Gospel according to Mark, the Gospel according to Matthew, and the Gospel according to Luke. The third of these has been said by Renan to be "the most beautiful book ever written."[1] A beautiful book is in all probability the product of a beautiful soul. The most beautiful book ever written, especially since it deals with spiritual themes and is the story of The Perfect Life, must have had an author worthy of our most intimate acquaintance, a man of noble soul and adequate training, interesting to us in every detail of his career and in every phase of his character.

We would like to know all about Homer and all about Shakespeare, or at least as

[1] Renan, Les Evangiles, p. 283, "C'est le plus beau livre qu'il y ait."

much as we know about Martin Luther and John Wesley; but the multitude of details concerning the private and the public life of Luther and Wesley utterly fail us when we come to these greatest geniuses of our literature. We know comparatively little about the personal life of Homer or of Shakespeare, and we know comparatively little about the author of this "most beautiful book ever written." Jesus we know, and Peter we know, and John we know, and Paul we know, and we know something of most of the twelve apostles and of many of the deacons and evangelists of the early church; and we owe most of our knowledge of these men to the evangelist Luke. We owe more of it to him than to any other man who ever lived or wrote about them. But Luke tells us little or nothing about himself. He never mentions his own name either in the Gospel or in the book of Acts. He makes one reference to himself in the use of the personal pronoun in the preface to the Gospel, "It seemed good to *me* also to

write,"[1] and the use of the plural pronouns "we" and "us" in the book of Acts has been generally supposed to indicate the entrance of Luke himself upon the scene.

Luke's name, however, appears only three times in the New Testament: in Philem. 24, "Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, my fellow workers" salute you; Col. 4. 14, "Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas salute you," and 2 Tim. 4. 10, 11, where after declaring, "Demas forsook me, having loved this present world," Paul adds, "Only Luke is with me." We notice that in each of these three passages Luke and Demas are mentioned together, Demas being a fellow worker in the first two passages, but having forsaken Paul in the last of them, while Luke alone remained faithful and present with him. It is also worth noticing that in the immediate context of each of these passages the name of the other evangelist and author of a Gospel narrative who was not an apostle

[1] Luke 1, 3.

occurs. Mark is mentioned in Philem. 24; Col. 4. 10; and 2 Tim. 4. 11.

Upon the basis of these three passages in which his name occurs what facts may we glean concerning the author of the most beautiful book in all literature?

II. The Name "Luke"

We begin with the name itself. 1. "Luke," in the Greek Λουκᾶς, is a very uncommon name. We are told that it is not to be found in the writings of any classical author or upon any Greek or Latin inscription, and that it does not occur before New Testament times. It is a peculiar name, distinctive by its very strangeness and infrequency. It seems to be a contracted or shortened form of "Lucanus," in the Greek Λουκανός (which is found in inscriptions), as "Apollos" was a shortened form of "Apollonius," and "Silas" of "Silvanus." These three men, Lucas, Apollos, and Silas, were all friends of the apostle Paul, and in their ministry with him they must have been thrown into intimate association with each other;

and they all had nicknames, or, rather, shortened and abbreviated names by which they were called in preference to the full name, which was too long for common or familiar use.[1] In the earliest copies of the Latin Bible the name "Lucanus" frequently occurs in the title of the Gospel, "Cata Lucanum."

2. Dean Plumptre has called attention to the fact that the only other noted man of this immediate period in history who bore the name "Lucanus" was the Latin poet, the author of the "Pharsalia," the epic poem which set forth the struggle between Julius Cæsar and Pompey for the supreme power at Rome.[2] Now, this Lucanus was born in the year A. D. 39, and therefore he was probably thirty or forty years younger than our Luke, the author of the third Gospel. Dean Plumptre has made this further most interesting suggestion:

[1] Other examples are: "Amplias" for "Ampliatus" (Rom. 16. 8), "Olympas" for "Olympiodorus" (Rom. 16. 15), "Demas" for "Demetrius" (Col. 4. 14), "Epaphras" for "Epaphroditus" (Col. 4. 12), "Zenas" for "Zenodorus" (Titus 3. 13), "Antipas" for "Antipatris" (Rev. 2. 13), "Stephanas" for "Stephanephorus" (1 Cor. 16. 15). See Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, ii, p. 83.

[2] Books of the Bible. New Testament, pp. 74, 75.

that it is just possible that the poet Lucanus was named after the physician Luke. If Luke were a beloved physician in the family when the boy Lucanus was born, the father and mother may have decided to show their appreciation of him and his services by naming the child after him. Every physician is likely to have namesakes, given him in just this way.

Is there any good reason for supposing that there was any personal relation between these two Lukes in this period of history? Yes, for if Luke the physician and Lucanus the poet were lifelong friends, and the physician was on intimate and trusted terms of familiarity with the poet's family, then Luke would be sure to make them acquainted with his beloved master, Paul, and through Luke they would be sure to hear about and to become more or less interested in Paul's preaching and Paul's apostolic career. Have we any indications of any such acquaintanceship with or interest in Paul on the part of any members of the family of Lucanus?

(1) In the eighteenth chapter of Acts we read that the Jews in Corinth seized the apostle Paul and brought him before the proconsul of Achaia, whose name was Gallio, and charged him with persuading men to worship God contrary to the law. When Paul was about to make answer to that charge Gallio interrupted him and told the Jews that if Paul had been guilty of any criminal behavior, he would try him, but if he were simply preaching a new form of Jewish doctrine, that was a matter upon which he did not choose to sit in judgment. Then he drove them from the judgment seat, and they were a most disappointed and angry set of men.[1] They had expected Gallio to put Paul in prison or to stop his evangelistic work in one way or another. They found him seemingly favorable to the prisoner and indisposed to interfere in any way with his mission and teaching. What was the explanation of this indifference to the complaints of the Jews and this willingness to befriend their

[1] Acts 18. 12–17.

prisoner, Paul? This Gallio was the uncle of Lucanus the poet. Had Luke the evangelist told Luke the poet all about Paul and his work, and had Luke the poet told his uncle Gallio enough of these things to prejudice him in Paul's favor? That would seem to be possible at least.

(2) Then in the time of Augustine and Jerome fourteen letters were extant which were supposed to have passed between the Latin philosopher Seneca and the apostle Paul. Those which have come down to our day have been pronounced spurious, but at that time they were believed to be genuine, and that very belief bore witness to the fact that there was a widespread tradition in the early church that there had been some personal acquaintance and intercourse between Seneca and Paul. Seneca was an official in the court of Nero while Paul was a prisoner at Rome. We read that Paul's Gospel became known through the whole Prætorian guard,[1] and that certain members of Cæsar's household

[1] Phil. 1. 13.

were converted,[1] and it is altogether probable that Seneca would hear about these things and would be interested to talk with such a man as Paul had proved himself to be.

Bishop Lightfoot has written an essay on Saint Paul and Seneca,[2] in which he has made a most interesting collection of the coincidences in thought and in language to be found in the extant and genuine writings of these two men; and if these coincidences are not sufficient to prove that the two men knew each other and were acquainted with each other's views, they go very far, at least, toward making that supposition probable. Now, Seneca was another uncle of Lucanus the poet. If Luke the evangelist was on terms of intimacy with the members of this family, we could find in that fact an explanation of the actual friendliness of Gallio and of the traditional friendship of Seneca for the apostle Paul. The name of the evangelist Luke, then, uncommon as it is, and having only one

[1] Phil. 4. 22. [2] Commentary on Philippians, pp. 270–333.

parallel in the history of this time, may furnish a suggestive link with the family of the poet Lucanus and so help us to explain the recorded and traditional relations between certain members of this family and the apostle Paul.

III. Luke, the Companion of Paul

We turn back to the three passages in which Luke's name occurs and we find that they all bear witness to another fact concerning him, namely, that he was for a part of his life, at least, the close companion of the apostle Paul. 1. We have noticed that at certain points in the narrative of the book of Acts the pronoun "we" occurs. It is understood usually that this pronoun marks the entrance of Luke himself upon the scene. If so, Paul finds Luke at Troas and takes him, with Timothy and Silas, into Macedonia on the first foreign missionary journey from the continent of Asia into the continent of Europe.[1] Here Paul seems to have left

[1] Acts 16. 10.

Luke in charge of the church at Philippi, since the pronoun "they" takes the place of the pronoun "we" in Acts 17. 1 and the narrative following. This was in A. D. 51. Seven years later, in A. D. 58, Paul finds Luke again here at Philippi,[1] and Luke goes with Paul on his journey to Jerusalem.[2] He was with Paul at the time of his arrest and went with him to Cæsarea. He remained with him during the two years of the Cæsarean imprisonment and accompanied him on the voyage to Rome. At the close of the narrative of the book of Acts Luke is still with Paul; and from 2 Tim. 4. 11 we learn that he was Paul's sole remaining companion at the time of the writing of that epistle. He probably stayed at his master's side to the day of Paul's martyrdom.

Are there any other Scriptures, except these passages in which his name occurs or the pronoun "we" discloses his presence, in which we may have any glimpse of Luke's ministry? 2. It has been suggested

[1] Acts 20. 5, 6. [2] Acts 21. 15–18.

by Epiphanius that Luke was one of the seventy sent out by our Lord as the forerunners in his village ministry.[1] Probably the only reason for such a suggestion is that Luke is the only one of the synoptics who has made any extended record of this evangelistic tour.

3. Theophylact thought that Luke was the unnamed companion of Cleopas in his walk to Emmaus on the resurrection day. This narrative too is peculiar to the third Gospel; but if Luke were a Gentile, as we shall have reason to conclude, that fact would rule out either of these possibilities. The seventy were, of course, all Jews; and the companion of Cleopas and resident of his home was a Jewess or a Jew.

4. It has been conjectured that Luke was one of the Greeks who asked to be introduced to Jesus at the time of the last feast in Jerusalem,[2] but even this suggestion does not seem to come within the realm of possibility, for Luke declares in the preface to his Gospel that he is about to record what

[1] Luke 10. 1–20. [2] John 12. 20.

eyewitnesses had reported to him, and thus clearly places himself among those who were wholly dependent upon tradition for what they knew of the gospel story. If he had been an eyewitness himself at any point, he surely would have claimed first-hand authority for his narrative in that place. He makes no such claim. We conclude, therefore, that he belonged to the second generation of believers and that he himself never saw Jesus.

5. However, in 2 Cor. 8. 18, 19, Paul speaks of some brother whose praise in the gospel was spread through all the churches and who had been appointed by the churches to travel with him, collecting money for the poor saints in Jerusalem. This unnamed brother may have been Luke. He traveled with Paul on so many other occasions, and he went with Paul when this collection was finally carried to Jerusalem. If he had labored in its gathering, he deserved to have some share in its distribution; or he may have been intrusted to see it safely to its destination.

Anyway, we are sure from our Scriptures that Luke was the close and congenial companion of the apostle Paul.

They must have liked each other, because they were like spirits. They were both educated men, with scholarly habits and with literary and cultured tastes. They were great-hearted, liberal-minded, broad-spirited. They must have influenced and strengthened each other in the development of their natural tendencies. They were probably about the same age, and they must have been drawn to each other from their first meeting, and their continued and lifelong friendship proved their perfect congeniality. Philip Schaff thinks that they were foreordained to be comrades,[1] and he points out other notable friendships in church history, at the time of the Reformation between Luther and Melanchthon, Zwingli and Œcolampadius, Calvin and Beza, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; and in the eighteenth century between the two Wesleys and Whitefield;

[1] History of the Christian Church, vol. i, p. 649.

and then in this same apostolic period between Peter and Mark. The Master sent out the apostles in the beginning two by two; and this recognized necessity for companionship and encouragement in the formative period of the church has manifested itself in all the great creative periods in church history since that time.

No one will ever be able to estimate how much service in the cause of Christ these congenial companionships between Christian colaborers have been. It may be that we owe to them the very existence of two of our four Gospels. Two of these Gospels were written by apostles—that according to Matthew and that according to John. The other two were written by the two congenial companions of the two greatest apostles, Peter and Paul. It is usually supposed that Mark's record of the life of Jesus was the first to be written, and that it was in some sense a summary of the teaching and preaching of Peter, whose interpreter and companion and

"son" in the gospel Mark was.[1] Peter and Mark were both men of sanguine temperament. They were both men of restless energy, ready to jump at conclusions rather than to take time to reason them out. They were both liable to make mistakes, and they were both ready to repent as soon as they realized that a mistake had been made. Paul could never have endured steady companionship with a man like John Mark. He would rather part company with Barnabas than keep company with him.[2] But Peter and Mark were a congenial pair, and the Gospel record written by Mark represents these two men in its general characteristics, brief, energetic, full of action, and unliterary as it is. On the contrary, the Gospel written by Luke is the longest and the most literary of the Gospels. It was the product of the cultured and congenial companion of the apostle Paul. Possibly, however, there was a still better or more imperative reason than mere personal

[1] 1 Pet. 5. 13. [2] Acts 15. 37–40.

pleasure in comradeship to account for the close connection existing for years between the apostle Paul and his traveling companion, Luke.

IV. Luke, the Physician

We turn again to Col. 4. 14 and we find that Paul not only calls Luke "beloved," but his "beloved physician," and we recall that just before Luke joined Paul at Troas in that first missionary advance into the continent of Europe Paul had been suffering from some infirmity of the flesh in Galatia,[1] and it may well have been that he was dreading a recurrence of that experience and asked Luke to go along with him to help to ward it off or to care for him if he were again disabled by it. We recall also that when Luke rejoins Paul at Philippi and accompanies him on the last voyage to Jerusalem it is just after Paul has been suffering again from an affliction in which he had even despaired of his life.[2] From this time on Luke remains con-

[1] Gal. 4. 13. [2] 2 Cor. 1. 9.

stantly at his side. Paul doubtless needed the continuous attention of a physician during these closing years of his life.

Luke was an attendant physician, but, more than that, he was Paul's beloved companion and friend. That fact throws a deal of light upon his character and goes far to make him a model for all men in his profession. Luke must have been thoroughly competent, or Paul would not have trusted him. We want the men into whose hands we put the preservation of our lives to have the best education that the schools can furnish them and plenty of practical experience before they begin to make any experiments upon us. Now, the best medical education in Paul's day was to be found among the Greeks, and all of the great medical authorities among the Greeks whose works are extant were Greeks of Asia Minor. Hippocrates can scarcely be called an exception, for he was born and lived on the island of Cos, off the coast of Caria. Galen came from Pergamus in Mysia, Dioscorides from Anazarba in Ci-

licia, and Aretæus from Cappadocia. These were the great masters in the medical profession, and they were all Asiatic Greeks.

The great university in Asia Minor in Luke's day was situated at Tarsus, which was the home of Paul. There was no other place in Asia Minor or in the world of that day where Luke could get as good a medical education as he could at Tarsus. If he went to school there, he may have met Paul either in the university or on the streets of that city; and if they became schoolboy friends and discovered their congeniality of spirit in those early days before either of them had been converted to the Christian faith, it would go far to explain their immediate union of fortunes and communion of interests when they met in after years at Troas. Paul knew that Luke was a thoroughly educated and competent physician and was willing to trust the treatment of his case in his hands without any hesitation. If he had known Luke in Tarsus in early youth, and had

known all about his university training there, at Troas he would learn all about Luke's experience as a physician in the long years that had elapsed since those university days.

It has been suggested that Luke must have practiced medicine, for a time at least, on one of the vessels plying up and down the Mediterranean, since he shows such an accurate acquaintance with technical nautical terms in his description of the voyage and the shipwreck in the twenty-seventh chapter of the book of Acts. We have already found reason to suppose that he may have been the trusted physician in the family of Lucanus the poet, and so have come into contact with such men as Gallio and Seneca. He may have been the physician as well as the friend of Theophilus, the man for whom he wrote his two volumes of history; and this Theophilus must have been a man of influence and prominence in the Christian Church of the early days. We shall see later that Luke may have had confidential

relations as physician with certain members of the royal court in Palestine. All the indications agree in leading us to the conclusion that Luke had had a varied and an unusually successful career as a physician after leaving school and before joining Paul at Troas.

He had had most excellent training in the beginning, and now he had years of experience behind him. He was no longer young and untried. Paul was more ready to trust him on that account. A young physician is always at a disadvantage as compared with a young lawyer or a young preacher. Theoretical knowledge may satisfy people in theology and law; and to the young man who knows nothing but what he has learned from his books they seem willing to intrust without much hesitation the care of their property and of their souls. But with their bodies they usually are more cautious. Their physician must have theoretical knowledge, to be sure; but to this knowledge he must have added practical experience before they feel safe in his

hands. So the young physician must wait until the wrinkles settle like weary-winged birds on his forehead and his brow and until his hair begins to be sprinkled with gray before everybody will be willing to trust him in therapeutics and surgery. Luke had served his apprenticeship successfully, and now he was trusted as a man of much experience, as well as of adequate preliminary training. But many a physician is trusted who is not beloved. Luke was both a trusted and a beloved physician. He must have had a sunny, cheerful, attractive disposition. He was a model in this respect to all in his profession.

The medical profession was born among the Greeks, like so many other good things. According to the Greeks, it was divine in its origin. Apollo, the sun-god, was the healer among the Greek divinities. The sun is the great healer now. The sun bath is the most healthful treatment, not only for tuberculosis, but for other human ills. The Greeks said that Æsculapius, the first physician, was the son of Apollo,

the sun-god. Every physician ought to have a sunny face and disposition. A dyspeptic doctor is worse than the quinine he gives. A sour breath, a sour face, a cross word ought all of them to be on the interdicted list with him. Luke was a Greek, of the race of Æsculapius and Hippocrates. He had the Greek gift of a joyous disposition, a pleasant manner, a lovable personality. He was the beloved physician because of his personal character.

Paul loved him, however, not only because he was a trained and trusted and agreeable physician, but also because he was a Christian, a missionary, an evangelist. A family physician need be second to no man in gaining the affections of those whom he serves. A Christian physician can get at the hearts of those whom he serves better than the Christian lawyer can, or the Christian business man, or the Christian minister. One need have no hesitancy in making a statement of that kind. The physician comes to know all the secrets of the household. The skeleton

in the closet may be hidden very easily from the minister, the business man, and even from the lawyer; but the physician finds it out, and as he keeps these secrets of his profession sacred he comes to be trusted and honored and revered.

In the sick-room, in the crisis moments of the disease, in the hours preceding the final death struggle, the physician finds a leverage power for the preaching of the gospel of Christ that the Sunday pulpit has never known and that cannot be found by any other professional man in the direct line of his professional work. If a man does not like what a preacher says in his pulpit or his private ministrations, he can get up and go away and he need not come again unless he desire to do so; but if his physician choose to talk religion to him on his sick-bed, he cannot get up and go away; he must perforce lie on his back and listen. A judicious Christian physician, improving every favorable opportunity to speak a word for his Master, may be the most successful evangelist in

any community. We have known the most successful and the most trusted and the most beloved physician in a given church community who brought more people into church membership, and had more converts as a direct result of his personal labors and appeals, than the preacher had for year after year of their joint ministry to that people. That was an exceptional case; but why might it not be an ordinary one?

The sick-room may become a sanctuary, devoted to serious meditation upon religious themes. As the body weakens the soul oftentimes suddenly expands. It becomes insistent that its claims shall be heard. It therefore follows that the physician often finds that ear attentive which has been deaf to the appeal of the pulpit, or anything that may have been said on the street in busy healthful life. Luke was both a physician and an evangelist. His praise was in all the churches for his good work in both these fields. He was beloved for his medical skill and for his ever-

aggressive and ever-attractive Christianity. He might well be a model for all in the medical profession. There is a Latin stanza which appraises his worth in this twofold capacity as follows:

Lucas, Evangelii et medicinæ munera pandens;
Artibus hinc, illinc religione, valet:
Utilis ille labor, per quem vixere tot ægri;
Utilior, per quem tot didicere mori![1]

V. Luke, the Musician

Have we now the complete picture of Luke the beloved physician as far as the Scriptures can help us to form one? Are there any other personal characteristics of which they make us reasonably sure? When we turn to Luke's own writings I think they will testify to at least one more feature of Luke's equipment as a physician and as an evangelist.

He was a man who was fond of music. He is the first great Christian hymnologist. He has preserved for us five great hymns of the early church. He is the only evangelist who has done that. His gospel nar-

[1] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 648.

rative begins with hymns and ends with praises. Now, music and medicine always go well together and singing and salvation always have gone hand in hand. Music will help the physician to drive out the devil of disease, and music will help the evangelist to drive out the devil of sin. The devil does not like music, and villainy has no natural affiliation with harmony. "The righteous doth sing and rejoice."[1]

As far as we can gather from any good authority on the subject, there is no music in hell. The Scriptures surely make no mention of any. There is weeping there, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth, but not a single song, not a musical note, no concord, no harmony. And as far as we can gather from all good authorities on the subject, when the old things have passed away and all things have become new, music will find its eternal home in heaven. *There* are harps of gold and songs of rejoicing, and all the courts of the king will resound forever with music and glad-

[1] Prov. 29. 6.

ness and all sorrow and sighing will flee away.

We remember what Shakespeare has said:

> The man that hath no music in himself,
> Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds,
> Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils;
> The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
> And his affections dark as Erebus:
> Let no such man be trusted.[1]

Such a man must be a villain, like "that spare Cassius" who reads much, seldom smiles, "hears no music."[2]

What is true of Shakespeare's ideal villain is true of villainy incarnate, the Evil One, as well. Burton in his Anatomy of Melancholy not only prescribes music as a sovereign remedy against that malady, but in the same breath declares that it is a remedy that "will drive away the devil himself." Luther in his Table-Talk is recorded as saying, "The devil is a saturnine spirit, and music is hateful to him, and drives him far from it." The Bible

[1] Merchant of Venice, Act v. Sc. 1. [2] Julius Cæsar, Act i. Sc. 2.

bears its testimony to the truthfulness of the statement. When the three kings had made Elisha the prophet mad, and for a moment the devil had taken possession of him, he cried, "Bring me a minstrel!" and under the soothing strains of the minstrelsy his rage was abated, his spirit was calmed, his soul was uplifted till the Spirit of the Lord came upon him and he broke out into the prophecy of blessing.[1] Music had driven the devil away.

Messengers went from Saul the monarch to the shepherd lad tending his flocks out on the hills. They told David, "His Majesty is afflicted beyond measure; at intervals he seems to be devil-possessed; and when the fury seizes him neither physician nor priest can do any good; and he has been told that your harp would help to make him well." So David went to the king's relief; and it came to pass when the evil spirit was upon Saul, that David took an harp and played with his hand. So Saul was refreshed and was well and the

[1] 2 Kings 3. 13–20.

evil spirit departed from him.[1] Secular history furnishes instances of a similar sort. Farinelli sang the perturbed spirit out of King Philip the Fifth. Charles the Great of France found no peace of soul until Orlando di Lasso brought to Paris the music that exorcised the evil spirit within him.

Walter Scott has pictured his Highlander, Allan McAulay, whose frenzy was often soothed by the harp of Annot Lyle. In the Cloister and the Hearth, Clement bethinks himself in his despair that possibly King Saul's music may afford him some relief, but he conceives his case most desperate. "Saul had a saint to play to him. He was not alone with the spirits of darkness; but here is no sweet bard of Israel to play to me: I, lonely, with crushed heart, on which a black fiend sitteth, mountain-high, must make the music to uplift that heart to heaven." Could it be hoped that music would accomplish such a task? Hear how Robert Browning sings:

[1] 1 Sam. 16. 14–23.

My heart! they loose my heart, those simple words;
Its darkness passes, which naught else could touch,
Like some dank snake that force may not expel,
Which glideth out to music sweet and low.

It was an ancient fable that the music of Orpheus could subdue the wildest of the beasts and could draw after him even the trees and the stones and the floods; but to music has been given this greater power over the snake and over that old serpent, the devil. When he had taken possession of earth God sent Music, his angel of mercy, to keep alive in man's heart the memory of heaven's harmony and to shield him from Satan's severest assaults.

There is no harmony in hell; that helps to make it what it is. The devil hates music; that is part of his curse. The snake never sings; neither does the vulture; nor any bird or beast of prey. Neither does the burglar, nor murderer, nor the villainous among men. It is only the happy and the innocent, the lark and the linnet: it is the righteous who sing and rejoice.

The Old Testament was full of singing and it has a hymn book in its heart. Luke believed that those Old Testament hymns could be adapted to Christian uses. He carries the hymnology of the Old Testament church over into the New. He is the father and the founder of Christian hymnology. Bishop Keble says of Luke:

> Thou hast an ear for angel songs,
> A breath the gospel trump to fill,
> And taught by thee the church prolongs,
> Her hymns of high thanksgiving still.

He shows us how the very beginning of the Christian era was ushered in with songs, and how the Christian Church sang its way through its earliest triumphs. When Paul and Silas had been cast into the inner prison and their feet were made fast in the stocks, at midnight they sang praises unto God until an earthquake opened their prison doors and everyone's bands were loosed. I have often wondered if those hymns which Paul and Silas sang were not composed by Luke. Timothy and Luke were with Paul and Silas

there at Philippi. They may have been keeping their midnight vigil just outside the prison walls, and when they heard the prisoners singing some of Luke's gospel hymns they knew that imprisonment had not daunted the spirits of those apostles of God's grace.

They were like David, who was a hunted outlaw, and had to hide himself in dens and caves of the earth, and who yet sang psalms and rejoiced. They were like David's greater Son, who had finished his last supper with his disciples and was facing toward betrayal and denial and death, and who yet sang a hymn with them before they went out to Gethsemane. They were like Paul Gerhardt, who while in deep distress composed that famous song beginning,

> Give to the winds thy fears,
> Hope and be undismayed.

They were like Martin Luther, who had heard bad news, very bad news, and who said, "Come, let us sing a psalm, and spite the devil."

They were like Bunyan's Pilgrim, who sang at the very beginning of his pilgrimage toward the Celestial City, sang upon the Hill of Difficulty, sang in the Chamber of Peace, sang after his duel with Apollyon, and sang after his sight of the Delectable Mountains. They were like those pilgrims in the second part of Pilgrim's Progress who broke out into singing and so went on into the Land of Beulah, where the sun shineth evermore. They believed that the best way to get ready for heaven was to have psalms and hymns and spiritual songs filling their hearts all their time on earth. They believed that music and song were divine gifts and the Christian's peculiar heritage.

We believe that Luke was personally and largely influential in fastening this faith on the Christian Church. He had the Greek love for melody. He was full of music himself. He collected and recorded the first Christian hymns. He gave Paul medicine when he needed it, and when all medicines had failed, like another David

before another Saul, he ministered to him in melody until his physical ills and his spiritual wounds were all healed. He must have been a versatile genius, this man Luke, ready to serve and able to serve according to any man's need. No wonder that he was beloved by all, and his praise was in all the churches.

VI. Luke, the Artist

From church tradition we may add another accomplishment to this many-sided man. Dante Gabriel Rossetti has put this church tradition into his lines:

> Give honor unto Luke, evangelist,
> For he it was, the ancient legends say,
> Who first taught Art to fold her hands and pray.[1]

Luke was said to have painted the portrait of the Virgin.[2] The oldest witness to this fact is Theodorus Lector, who was reader in the Church of Constantinople in the sixth century. He tells us that the Empress Eudoxia found at Jerusalem a picture

[1] Sonnet lxxiv. In the House of Life.
[2] Plummer, International Critical Commentary on Luke, p. xxii.

of the God-Mother painted by Luke the apostle and she presented it to her daughter, Pulcheria, the wife of Theodosius II. In the Capella Paolina, in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, at Rome, a very ancient picture is preserved, a portrait of the Virgin ascribed to Luke. It can be traced back to A. D. 847, and it may be much older than that.

In the catacombs there is an inscription referring to a rude painting of the Virgin as "one of seven painted by Luca." This inscription may be the source of the later traditions. Or they may all have sprung from the fact that, as Plummer says: "Luke has had a great influence upon Christian art, of which in a real sense he may be called the founder. 'The Shepherd with the Lost Sheep on His Shoulder,' one of the earliest representations of Christ, comes from Luke 15; and both mediæval and modern artists have been specially fond of representing those scenes which are described by Luke alone: the annunciation, the visit of Mary to Elisabeth, the shep-

herds, the manger, the presentation in the temple, Simeon and Anna, Christ with the doctors, the woman at the supper of Simon the Pharisee, Christ weeping over Jerusalem, the walk to Emmaus, the good Samaritan, the prodigal son. Many other scenes which are favorites with painters might be added from the Acts."[1] Luke, says Philip Schaff, "is the painter of Christus Salvator and Christus Consolator."[2]

He may not have been an artist with his brush, but we know that he was an artist with his pen. He composed a book which a competent critic declares to be the most beautiful book ever written. In it he has portrayed the Virgin Mary and her Sinless Son and many other characters most beautiful and rare. He had an artist's soul. He loved the good and beautiful and true. He may have used the artist's tools. It would make him a very versatile genius indeed, if he were a competent physician and an accomplished musician and a painter of pictures besides. But we have

[1] Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. xxii. [2] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 660.

known just such versatile men again and again in the course of the centuries. Luke may have been one of them. We know that he was an extraordinary man in many respects; and we know that if he never put any portraits on canvas, he has put them on his written page with such artistic excellence that he may safely be said to be the founder of Christian art.

VII. Luke, the Gentile

We have suggested that Luke was in all probability a Gentile. Our reasons for so concluding are not absolutely compelling ones. They seem to establish the dominant probability in the case. They are as follows: 1. Luke's name is Greek.

2. His style is more like that of a Greek than a Jew. Philip Schaff declares that his writing is admirably suited to the Greek taste, and that the prologue to the Gospel would at once captivate the refined Hellenic ear by its classic construction. He compares it with the prologues of Herodotus and Thucydides and concludes that

Luke's prologue is unsurpassed for brevity, modesty, and dignity.[1] Of no other writer in the New Testament could such statements be made; and the easy conclusion is that Luke could write so much better Greek because he was himself a Greek.

3. In Col. 4. 10–14 Paul sends the salutations of Aristarchus, Mark, and Jesus Justus to the Colossians; and he says of them, "These are of the circumcision." Then he goes on to send the salutations of Epaphras, Luke, and Demas, as if these were not included among those of the circumcision whose salutations he sent first. If we could be sure that there was an intentional distinction here, as there certainly seems to be, it would settle the matter that Luke was indeed a Gentile by birth. If we so conclude, we have in Luke the only Gentile among the writers of the New Testament books. It would be interesting if we could decide not only that Luke was a Gentile, but also to what part of the Gentile world he belonged.

[1] Schaff, *op. cit.*, pp. 656, 664.

VIII. Luke, of Antioch

All indications seem to point to Antioch of Syria as his home. We list a few of these: 1. Eusebius[1] says that Luke belonged to an Antiochian family.

2. Jerome[2] tells us explicitly that Luke was a physician of Antioch, and a preface to the Gospel, written, as Harnack thinks, in the third century, says that Luke was by nation a Syrian of Antioch.

3. In the book of Acts Luke names the seven deacons appointed over the church of Jerusalem and locates only one of them, and he is "Nicolas of Antioch."[3] Why was Nicolas given this location? Was it because Luke had known him at Antioch and was proud of the fact that one of his fellow citizens had been appointed to such an office, and therefore considered it well worth his recording? James Smith points out the coincidence that of eight accounts of the Russian campaign of 1812, three written by Frenchmen and three written by Englishmen never mention the fact that

[1] Ecclesiastical History, iii, 4, 7. [2] De Viris Illustribus, vii. [3] Acts 6. 5.

the Russian General Barclay de Tolly was of Scotch extraction; but the two accounts of that campaign written by the two Scotchmen, Scott and Alison, both mention it. It was of more importance to them; at least it was of sufficient importance to seem to them to be well worth chronicling.

4. Luke seems to be well acquainted with the history of the church at Antioch and gives us an unusually full account of its pastors and teachers and their enterprises and their trials. He makes the church at Antioch the mother of all the Gentile churches; and he says that the Christians were first called by that name in Antioch. Luke seems to be well acquainted with all the controversies in the church in this city. It is to Antioch that Barnabas summons Saul, and in their labors together in the synagogues of Antioch they are made ready for their advance upon the Gentile world. It is from Antioch that Barnabas and Saul are sent forth to their great missionary campaigns; and it is to Antioch

that they return to make their reports. Such records as we find in Acts 11. 19–30, and 13. 1–3, and 15. 1–3, 30–40 lead us to suppose that Luke must have been resident in Antioch and that he was personally acquainted with the events which he has narrated at such comparatively unusual length.

5. There is a reading peculiar to Codex Bezæ, which was known to Augustine, and which was accepted by him as genuine and of good authority, and which would go far to settle this probability of Luke's residence in Antioch if we adopted it, for it would represent the first occurrence of the pronoun "we" in the narrative and would locate the narrator in Antioch. After Acts 11. 27, which reads, "Now in these days there came down prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch," Codex Bezæ has the following statement: "And there was great rejoicing; and when we were gathered together one of them named Agabus stood up," and so on. According to this reading, Luke was a member of the church at An-

tioch at this time. If so, Luke was probably among the very first Gentile converts to Christianity in Antioch. It may have been the preaching or the personal influence of his former school friend, Saul, that brought him into the Christian Church. At any rate, their association in Christian work would have begun at this time and place.

6. There is still another indication of Luke's connection with Antioch. He dedicates both his books to the "most honorable Theophilus." Now, the Clementines tell us that Theophilus was a wealthy citizen of Antioch. He probably held some official position there. The title which Luke gives him is the title given to the governors Felix and Festus in the book of Acts,[1] and it may be reserved for those who are employed in the government service, and for these alone. Then the better translation of the title would be, "most honorable" or "most noble." This Theophilus was a wealthy man and a

[1] Acts 23. 26; 24. 3; 26. 25.

Christian man, and it may be that he was Luke's literary patron and furnished him the leisure and the financial backing necessary for the publication of his two volumes of history.

IX. Luke, the Freedman

Some have thought that Luke was a freedman. The reasons suggested for such a conclusion are: 1. It was a custom among both the Greeks and the Romans to educate some one of their domestic slaves in the medical profession, and if he proved expert in it, it was not an unusual thing for them to grant him his freedom in return for his services. A large number of the physicians of that day are said to have belonged to this class.

2. Such names as Luke's, contractions in *as*, as "Lucas" for "Lucanus," we are told, were peculiarly common in the names of slaves. Luke was a man of broad sympathies for all the down-trodden and the poor, as his writings well show. Did he learn this sympathy for all the wretched

ones when he was a slave, and in all his after life of freedom did he never lose his memory of their need? And was it therefore one of his chief delights in the gospel that in his conception of it its first and chief mission was to preach good tidings to the poor, to proclaim release to the captives, and to set at liberty them that are bruised?[1]

If Luke began life as a slave, he must have made the most of all the opportunities offered him, and very early in life he must have proved himself worthy of freedom; and in his later life, with his scientific and professional training, he was a worthy and beloved associate of those other university graduates, Paul and Apollos, and possibly Barnabas. Of all the first preachers of the gospel these alone would seem to have had the advantages of the schools, and most naturally they drifted together and found the greatest pleasure in each other's congenial companionship. College men are birds of a feather, and, unless

[1] Luke 4. 18.

there be some personal reason to the contrary, they are sure to flock together; and if they do so, their service to any cause they may espouse is usually found to be the most efficient service it can muster.

Barnabas was the great reconciler in the infant church. Apollos was the great orator; and if he wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, he added the finest literary composition to the books of the New Testament. Paul was the church organizer and pioneer missionary and systematic theologian without a peer. Luke was the author of the most beautiful book ever written and the incomparable historian of the early church. It would seem that Christianity could not have gotten along very well in the beginning without these four college men, as it has not been able to get along very well at any time since without the leadership of men of the highest education. Three of these men, Barnabas, Paul, and Luke, possibly met each other for the first time in the University of Tarsus; and their friendship formed in college may have had

much to do with the shaping of their future lives. Apollos came from the rival school at Alexandria; but when he became a Christian he was admitted to their circle without question as a man of culture and refinement, and therefore sure to furnish serviceable and congenial companionship.

X. Luke in Later Tradition

The later church traditions concerning Luke do not date farther back than the fourth century, A. D. Epiphanius tells us that after Paul's death Luke preached in Italy and in Gaul and in Dalmatia and in Macedonia.[1] We are told that he lived to the age of eighty-four. One account says that he was finally crucified in the Peloponnesus, at Elcæa, on an olive tree. Another account says that he died a natural death in Bithynia. Later we read that his bones were brought from Patras in Achaia by the order of the emperor Constantine and were buried in the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople.

[1] Haer. 51.

XI. An Outline Biography

We have now before us all the facts and all the inferences and traditions out of which it might be possible to construct an ideal biography of the evangelist Luke. Shall we make the attempt to outline his career upon the basis of these?

1. He was born a slave boy in the household of Theophilus, a wealthy government official in Antioch. He grew up into most engaging appearance and most attractive personality. He was of a peculiarly acute intellect and of a most obliging disposition. He won his master's confidence and then his personal liking. Theophilus decided to educate the boy at his own expense and at the best university in the land. So it was that the second capital event in the life of Luke was his matriculation at Tarsus.

2. Here he studied medicine, where the great masters in that profession, Aretæus, Dioscorides, and Athenæus, had been educated. Just a few miles away at Ægæ stood the great Temple of Æsculapius, which furnished the nearest approach to

the modern hospital to be found in the ancient world. From the university lectures Luke got the theory of medicine; in the Temple of Æsculapius he got the practice and experience he needed. He made the acquaintance of Barnabas and Saul here, and laid the foundations for a lifelong friendship with these men.

3. His education completed, he returned to Antioch and rendered faithful and most successful service in his master's family. Then the gospel was preached at Antioch, and Luke was among the first to hear it and to accept it. He told his master, Theophilus, about it, and Theophilus himself became interested and at last converted. Then about the first thing Theophilus did as a Christian was to give Luke his freedom.

4. The first impulse of the freedman Luke was to get away from all the scenes of his servitude and to test his new-found liberty by wandering far and wide at his own sweet will. He shipped as a physician upon one of the vessels plying up and down

the Mediterranean, and there he had manifold experiences. His outlook was broadened as he saw more of the world. He was of service to many people and he made many friends.

5. On one of his voyages he met some members of the family of Lucanus, the poet, and they persuaded him to accompany them to their home in Corduba in Spain. Luke was there when the poet was born, and the baby boy was named after him. In this household he became acquainted with Gallio and Seneca and many other notable men. The slave boy had risen to a considerable height, for his natural ability and his excellent education and his goodness of heart enabled him to converse with the best of men as their equal, and as a freedman and physician he was admitted to terms of intimacy which otherwise would have been impossible.

6. In due time he came back to Antioch and was resident there when many of the stirring events which he narrates in the history of its Christian Church took place.

7. Later he removed to Troas and settled there, where Paul found him on his second missionary journey. He went with Paul to Philippi, and was left in charge of that church for seven years.

8. He left Philippi with Paul in A. D. 58, and remained with Paul thereafter until the apostle's martyrdom.

9. Some time after this event he wrote the third Gospel and the book of Acts for Theophilus, and he fully intended to write a third volume continuing the history, but he was swept away into the tide of Christian evangelism and never found the leisure to do it.

10. He labored as an evangelist in many lands, and in a ripe old age he fell on sleep and was buried somewhere in Greece.

11. Luke was one of the most respected and best-beloved members of the early church. His praise was in all the churches. All women liked him and all men honored him. Apollos and he were the most accomplished writers, and Paul and he were the most prolific writers of the New Tes-

tament times. Take the writings of Luke and Paul out of the New Testament and it would be less than half its present size; and of the larger half of the present contents of the New Testament Luke wrote more than Paul. He was a most versatile man—a physician, a musician, a painter, a poet, a preacher, a prolific author, an intrepid missionary—a man with many gifts and many friends and manifold accomplishment. His biography was a romance. His books are invaluable. Both he and they are worth our knowing and knowing well.

PART TWO: THE GOSPEL

THE GOSPEL

I. Sources of the Gospel

Luke was not an eyewitness of the events in the gospel history. Where did he get his information concerning these things he has recorded? We turn to the beginning words of the Gospel to find what he himself has to say about it. He tells us that he wrote of his own accord, and the only credential he presents for the trustworthiness of his narrative is that of painstaking investigation of all the sources of information at his command. He certifies, however, that the result of this investigation is a fuller, more accurate, and more orderly account of the life of Jesus than any of which he knew.

He divides the chief sources of the facts he has written into documentary material and oral testimony. There had been many

attempts at narrative of which in their manuscript form he was able to avail himself and upon which he hoped to improve. There were also many eyewitnesses still living whom he was able to interview and who delivered to him their first-hand information concerning many things. Upon the basis of his documents and the careful recording of apostolic tradition as given to himself Luke assures Theophilus that he may rely upon the certainty of the things he here finds recorded.[1] 1. We ask, What were Luke's documents?

We think we can distinguish a few of them. (1) After the introduction explaining the authority and the aims of the book, the first two chapters of the third Gospel are full of Hebraic expressions and differ so widely in style and general character from the remainder of the Gospel that almost all scholars have concluded that they are translations from the Aramaic, and probably represent two or three written sources. We may find the con-

[1]Luke 1. 1-4.

clusions of these fragments at 1. 80; 2. 40; and 2. 52.

(2) The genealogy in 3. 23–38 must have been taken, of course, from some legal or tribal or temple document.

(3) It does not seem probable that Luke was acquainted with our Gospel according to Matthew either in the Greek or in the Hebrew. It is possible that he did not know the Gospel according to Mark in its present form. We know, however, that Mark was at Rome with Paul in A. D. 64, according to Col. 4. 10 and Philem. 24. We know, further, that Luke was there at the same time.[1] When we notice, therefore, that there are certain portions of Luke's narrative which are paralleled in Mark's account and which are not to be found in the Gospel according to Matthew, the most natural and adequate explanation of these parallels between Mark and Luke would be found in the personal association of these two men at Rome, where they could compare notes of ma-

[1] Col. 4. 14.

terial already collected. Of these passages in Luke, not to be found in Matthew, but paralleled in Mark and possibly derived from manuscript notes made by Mark himself, we may mention the story of the demoniac healed in the synagogue on the Sabbath,[1] the journey through Galilee,[2] the prayer of the demoniac,[3] the complaint of John against the man who would not follow with them, but who would persist in casting out devils, nevertheless,[4] and the women bringing spices to the sepulcher.[5]

2. Among the eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word from whom Luke could have obtained some information we may be sure of some, at least. (1) As a physician Luke would come into confidential relations with many women, and as the women who ministered to Jesus and had had personal experiences with him during the course of his ministry came to know Luke and to like him and trust him they could tell him some of these things con-

[1] Luke 4. 33–37. [2] 4. 43, 44. [3] 8. 38. [4] 9. 49. [5] 24. 1.

cerning women and their relation to Jesus which Luke alone has preserved for us. Such facts as we find in Luke 7. 36–50; 8. 2, 3; 10. 38–42; 11. 27; 23. 27–29, 49, 56 must have come from the women themselves.

(2) Luke seems to have had some special source of information concerning matters pertaining to the court of Herod. The information given us in such passages as 8. 3; 13. 32; 23. 5–12 is to be found in Luke's narrative alone. We read in Acts 13. 1 that Paul and his companions, among whom Luke may have been one, were associated with Manaen, the foster brother of Herod. It is easy to conclude that all inside information concerning Herod and his court came to Paul or to Luke through him.

(3) In Acts 21. 16 we are told that Luke lodged while at Jerusalem with Mnason of Cyprus, who had been a disciple from the beginning. Here, then, was another who could give him original information concerning many things.

(4) There must have been many other early disciples whom Luke met at various times. He may have met Peter and Barnabas at Antioch. He would surely meet James and the elders of the church when he came with Paul to Jerusalem.

(5) During the two years of Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea Luke became acquainted with Philip the evangelist and his daughters. All they knew as to the facts of Christ's life they would gladly share with Luke.

(6) At Cæsarea Luke was only fifty miles from Jerusalem, and there was a good road between the two cities; and he was only two days' journey from the shores of Lake Gennesaret. A man bent upon tracing accurately from the first the course of events in the life of the Lord hardly could have failed to visit these places, and, exploring among them and on into Peræa, Luke could have picked up such items of information as we find in 7. 11–17; 24. 13–35 and many things in the Peræan ministry which we find recorded nowhere else.

We do not know what Luke was doing during the two years of Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea, but we may be sure that he was employing his time well; and what more congenial employment could he have found than the gathering of materials for a narrative of the things which had been fulfilled in that vicinity in the founding of the Christian Church? He could interview any number of eyewitnesses and he could trace the course of all things accurately from the first in personal investigation. Did he write the Gospel at this time?

II. Date of the Gospel

There are those who think that Luke must have written the third Gospel either during Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea or the immediately succeeding imprisonment at Rome. The following authorities agree that the narrative as we have it was written before or about A. D. 63: Alford, Ebrard, Farrar, Gloag, Godet, Hofmann, Hug, Keil, Lange, Lumby, Schaff, Tholuck, Wieseler, and others. They say: 1. The

Gospel according to Luke must have been written before the book of Acts, and the book of Acts does not say anything about the death of Paul, and the close of its narnative seems to coincide with the date of Luke's writing. Therefore both the Gospel and the book of Acts were written before the date of Paul's martyrdom. 2. When Luke tells us about the prophecy of the famine made by Agabus in Acts 11. 28 he is careful to add that the prophecy was fulfilled in the days of Claudius; but when he tells us about the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem made by Jesus, in Luke 21. 5–36, he does not say that that prophecy was fulfilled. He surely would have done so if he had been writing later than A. D. 70. He does not do so because the destruction of the capital city had not yet taken place.

However, many other authorities think that we must decide upon a later date for the composition of the third Gospel. They point out the following facts: 1. We must allow time for a large number of people to

draw up narratives concerning the sayings and doings of Jesus.

2. Twice in the Gospel[1] Luke puts the name of John before that of his brother James in naming the two together. Matthew and Mark never do that. They always put James first. This seems to be an indication that Luke wrote at a later period than the other two synoptists, and at a time when James had died or when for some other reason John was being recognized as the more prominent or influential of the two.

3. The prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem as recorded in Luke are much more definite than the parallel prophecies in Matthew and Mark. Even though Luke does not say that these prophecies had been fulfilled, their greater definiteness bears witness to that fact. After the event the details of the sayings of Jesus concerning it were remembered more vividly and recorded more accurately.

4. In the midst of these prophecies in

[1] 8. 51 and 9. 28.

Matthew and Mark the evangelists have inserted a note of warning to their readers —"Let him that readeth understand."[1] Luke omits this clause, the time for such warning having gone by.

5. The designation of Jesus as "Lord," not found at all in Mark and only occasionally in Matthew, is more frequent in Luke. This seems to be a mark of later date, when this title was becoming more common among the disciples. Among those who believe that the Gospel was written after the death of Paul and after the destruction of Jerusalem and in the later old age of Luke, we may mention Beyschlag, Bleek, Cook, Credner, De Wette, Ewald, Julicher, Plummer, Ramsay, Renan, Reuss, Sanday, Schenkel, and Weiss.

III. Place of Writing

Jerome says that Luke wrote the Gospel in Achaia and Boeotia. Godet selects the city of Corinth as the most likely place. Holtzmann, Hug, Keim, and Zeller guess

[1] Matt. 24. 15; Mark 13. 14.

that the Gospel was written at Rome, Michælis and Tholuck at Cæsarea, Hilgenfeld in Asia Minor, and Köstlin at Ephesus. Plummer says there is no evidence for or against any of these places. Weiss adds that "all conjectures as to the place of composition are quite visionary and have no value whatever." Under these circumstances may we not conjecture that it was at Cæsarea in the days of Paul's imprisonment that the first considerable gathering of material for this Gospel narrative was made, and that Luke continued his work as opportunity offered during the later imprisonment at Rome, and that in the after days in the moments of leisure he may have snatched from his missionary labors he completed the book, giving it its final touches in some village retreat in Greece, and writing last of all the preface dedicating it to Theophilus some time between A. D. 70 and 80? This gradual gathering and shaping of the material in hand would leave room to account for all the phenomena involved in the text, and the

final finishing in the intervals of an itinerant missionary village visitation in Greece would meet the requirement of Jerome's suggestion that it was composed in places in both Achaia and Bœotia. In various humble village homes by the light of a dim-burning olive-oil wick we see the beloved evangelist completing the most beautiful book ever written.

IV. The Gospel for the Gentiles

When we turn to the study of the book, the first thing we notice is that it is written from a Gentile point of view, and that makes it noteworthy at once. It is the only book in the New Testament of which that can be said, except the book of Acts, also written by Luke.

All the other books in our Bible, both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, were written by Jews. Our Bible is a Jewish book from beginning to end, as far as authorship is concerned. Its writers were Jews or Christian Jews, but they "were all of the Hebrew race, and they all

had more or less of the Hebrew prejudice and point of view. Jesus was a Jew. All of the twelve apostles were Jews. All of the first churches were composed wholly of Jews. Even Paul, the champion of the Gentiles, was himself a Jew, and he never wholly freed himself from the results of his rabbinical training and thought. If Luke had not written these books, all of Gentile Christendom would have been dependent forever upon Jewish sources for the whole of its record of the revelation of God unto men. But in these two books we see how the life of Jesus and the fortunes of the early Christian Church appear from a Gentile point of view. The Gospel according to Matthew gives us a Jewish point of view. The Gospel according to Mark gives us a Jew's account, adapted to the use of Gentiles. Now Luke, a Gentile, will write for Gentiles, and our New Testament will have a Gentile Gospel, a Gospel written for us and by one of ourselves."[1]

How do we know that Luke is writing

[1] Hayes, The Synoptic Problem, p. 80.

for us rather than for the Jews? 1. Because of his explanations of things with which the Jews were perfectly familiar, but of which Gentiles might be supposed to be ignorant. He tells us that Nazareth was a city of Galilee.[1] He gives us the same information concerning Capernaum.[2] He says that the feast of unleavened bread was called the passover.[3] All Jews knew these things without being told. Luke wrote them down for the benefit of those who were not acquainted with the geography of Palestine or with the feasts of the Jewish ritual. However, it is when we turn from such small details to consider the general spirit of the book that its Gentile point of view becomes most apparent.

2. Of the three synoptic Gospels this is by far the most catholic in its sympathies and universalistic in its outlook. (1) It has a genealogy of Jesus, even as Matthew had, but the genealogy of Matthew was a Jewish genealogy. It gave the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son

[1] 1. 26. [2] 4. 31. [3] 22. 1.

of Abraham.[1] Abraham was the father of the Jews, and Matthew was content to show that Jesus was a descendant of Abraham, a genuine Jew by race. Luke is not content with that genealogy, and therefore he writes another one, and he carries the line of ancestors back of David and back of Abraham and up to Adam, the father of the human race. Then he says of Adam that he was the son of God.[2] Was Jesus a Jew and a son of Abraham, and did he therefore belong to the Jewish race? Yes, that was all true, but it was not the whole of the truth. Jesus was a Jew, but he was more than that: he was a man, and he belonged to all mankind.

That was the first thing that this Gentile Gospel would make perfectly clear to the world. Our Lord is a son of Adam, as we are sons of Adam. He is flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. He is our brother-man. He is not far from every one of us. Our God hath made of one blood all nations of men; and if any man will seek

[1] Matt. 1. 1. [2] 3. 38.

for our Lord, he will find that he is of one blood with himself, a son of Adam, a son of God. Jesus is the last Adam. He belongs to humanity. He is the Kinsman-Redeemer of the race. Matthew gave us the Jewish genealogy. Luke makes it a Gentile genealogy by carrying it beyond Abraham the father of the Jews to Adam the father of the race. Jesus belongs to the Jews, but he belongs to us as well as to them. He is the Saviour of all men. He is the Head of all humanity.

(2) We look into Matthew's narrative, and we find the story of the wise men coming from the East with their question, "Where is he who is born *King of the Jews?*"[1] We turn to Luke's account of the birth of Jesus and we find no such question, but an angel makes announcement from the open sky, "I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be *to all the people.*"[2] The Jesus of whom Luke writes is to be, not only the King of the Jews, but also the Saviour of all men.

[1] Matt. 2. 2. [2] 2. 10.

(3) Matthew tells us that Isaiah spoke of John the Baptist and called him

> The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
> Make ye ready the way of the Lord,
> Make his paths straight.[1]

Luke tells us about the ministry of John the Baptist, and he quotes the prophecy of Isaiah as fulfilled in him; but he is not willing to stop where Matthew did in that quotation. He carries it on until he makes of it a prophecy of comfort to the Gentiles. He says: "Listen! These are the words with which Isaiah continues his prophecy,

> Every valley shall be filled,
> And every mountain and hill shall be brought low;
> And the crooked shall become straight,
> And the rough ways smooth;
> And *all flesh shall see the salvation of God.*"[2]

It surely was worth while to add that sentence, for it shows that this Jewish prophecy is of interest to all mankind. Gentiles as well as Jews are to see the salvation of God.

[1] Matt. 3. 3. [2] Luke 3. 5, 6.

(4) Did Jesus confine practically the whole of his own ministry to the Jews? Yes, but Luke is careful to tell us what no one of the other evangelists had recorded for us, that in his ministry to the Jews Jesus reminded them again and again that the providence of God had been displayed in behalf of the Gentiles as well as in behalf of themselves. In the beginning of his ministry, in the synagogue at Nazareth, Jesus said: "There were many Jewish widows in the time of Elijah, but Elijah passed them all by and his miraculous help was given to a heathen widow in Sidon. And there were many Jewish lepers in the time of Elisha, but the prophet did not heal any of them. He healed the Syrian heathen Naaman instead."[1] The Jews were filled with wrath at these sayings and cast Jesus out of their city. That was just the difference between Jesus and his fellow countrymen, Luke seems to say. They were exclusive and intolerant; he was sympathetic with all. They wanted

[1] Luke 4. 25–30.

all good things for themselves; he shared all his good things with all who asked for them and all who needed them, Samaritans or Galileans, Gentiles or Jews.

(5) Possibly the most characteristic parables of the gospel which Jesus preached are to be found in the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel according to Luke. Those three parables, the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son, sum up all the good news of certain salvation to sinful men, and two of them, the lost coin and the lost son, are recorded only by Luke. The three parables surely would rank among the most precious of all the sayings of Jesus. They teach the Father's uncalculating and unceasing sacrifice and search until the last lost sheep is found. They teach the Father's loving illumination and diligent labor until the last coin with his image and superscription upon it has been restored. They teach the Father's warm welcome for every prodigal who turns his face toward home. His grace is free to all, and it never fails. We could spare any other parable better than

the parable of the prodigal son. We owe its preservation to the Gentile Luke.

(6) We are not surprised to find that the words, "grace," "Saviour," "salvation," and "evangelize" are found in this Gospel more often than in any other. Luke himself was an evangelist. He tells us that the angels are evangelists,[1] and John the Baptist was an evangelist,[2] and Jesus was an evangelist,[3] and the twelve apostles were evangelists.[4] Ten times in this book that verb, "to evangelize," occurs. The whole of the Gospel has to do with good news for all.

"In that first sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth Jesus read for his text from the prophet Isaiah:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor:
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.

[1] 1. 19 and 2. 10. [2] 3. 18. [3] 4. 18, 43; 7. 22; 8. 1; 16. 16; 20. 1. [4] 9. 6.

There Jesus closed the book and gave it back to the attendant. It was a strange place to quit in his reading. It was right in the middle of a sentence. Jesus did not read the whole of the prophecy. He did not even finish the paragraph. He did not even read to a period. There was much of comfort and of good news in the remainder of the sentence and of the paragraph and of the prophecy. Jesus stops short at this point. Surely, it must have been with conscious intention. Surely, it must have been with some good reason. We look for that reason and we find that the next following words were, 'And to proclaim the day of vengeance of our God.' When the eyes of Jesus fell upon those words he closed the book. He would not read them. His message was a message of grace and not a proclamation of vengeance. He would rather leave the sentence unfinished than to leave any doubt in any mind as to that fact. He went on to preach his good tidings, and we read that all bare him witness, and wondered at

the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth.[1]

"Luke does not wonder. He seems to think that only words of grace would be natural to Jesus. He pictures the Master as the gracious Redeemer, gracious both in matter of speech and in manner of life. Over against the ungraciousness of Simon the Pharisee Luke sets in contrast the graciousness of Jesus to the woman who was a sinner. He was a perfect gentleman even to her. She had heard him talk of the grace of God. She was willing to put it to the test for herself. Jesus did not fail her in the moment of trial. His graciousness included all. It recognized no barrier of social distinctions. The courtesy which Simon had failed to show to his guest she more than made up with her love. Jesus could not be outdone in courtesy by anyone. He was even more gracious to her than she was grateful to him.[2]

"Was the grace of God ever set forth with such pathetic impressiveness as in that

[1] 4. 22. [2] 7. 48.

pearl of all the parables, where we read that while the returning prodigal was yet a long way off his father saw him and ran to meet him, and then celebrated his return with the best robe and a fitting feast and music and dancing? The grace of the dancers was only the faintest symbol of the grace in that father's heart. No gracious act of earth can do more than typify the heavenly Father's exhaustless grace. Can we imagine the grace in the manner of Jesus and in his tone as he spoke that parable?

"How gracious he was to the ten lepers, although one of them was an alien Samaritan! How gracious he was to Zacchæus, promising salvation to his house, although he had been a defrauding and despicable publican, as little and mean in his spirit as he was little and mean in his stature. How gracious he was to Mary when Martha's short temper had snapped and she was ready to ask the Master to join her in scolding the remissness of the younger girl! Jesus was as gracious to her as her sister was indignant with her.

"How gracious he was to that dying thief! The malefactor was suffering his just deserts. He had been a robber, and in all probability a murderer, and he was receiving the penalty due for his crimes. His fellow malefactor prayed to Jesus for salvation, 'Save thyself and us,' but it was in words of mockery and not of devotion; and Jesus paid no heed to him. Possibly he was the only one who ever asked Jesus for salvation and found his cry for help unheeded. The other dying thief recognized the innocence of Jesus and rebuked his fellow sufferer for his failure in courtesy to such a character. He did not ask for salvation from the cross or from death. He asked Jesus only to remember him when the kingdom preached had come. It was the most sublime faith chronicled in our New Testament. He believed in the character of Jesus and in the coming of his kingdom, despite all contrary evidence. All of the disciples of Jesus had forsaken him and fled away. They had seen Jesus raise the dead and yet their faith had

failed them in that hour. The thief upon the cross sees Jesus dying upon the cross at his side, and yet has faith in him!

"Now see with what graciousness Jesus makes response to such faith. 'Verily—there is no doubt about it. I am not stating to you a mere possibility, but a most certain truth; for where I am there shall also my servants be with me; therefore,—I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'[1] Bossuet comments upon this promise as follows: "To-day—what speed!—with me—what companionship!—in Paradise—what rest!' Jesus had consorted with all classes of people here upon the earth. He had been no respecter of persons during his ministry. He went into paradise hand in hand with a crucified thief. His graciousness will be his characteristic through all eternity to come. As it was manifest to all alike in the days of his ministry it will be manifest to all alike for evermore."[2]

(7) At three crisis points in his narrative

[1] 23. 43. [2] Compare Hayes, The Synoptic Problem, pp. 80–84.

Luke shows us how Jesus was rejected by the Galilæans,[1] and by the Samaritans,[2] and by the Judæans and the assembled nation of the Jews at the passover feast.[3] The significant inference is that the gospel must look beyond all of these for its greatest future growth, and in the book of Acts Luke shows how that actually came to pass.

(8) We note that in the beginning of the Gospel Luke is the only one of the evangelists who tells us the story of Simeon, and the only one to record the song of that aged saint:

Now lettest thou thy servant depart, Lord,
According to thy word, in peace;
For mine eyes have seen thy salvation,
Which thou hast prepared before the face of *all peoples;*
A light for revelation to the Gentiles,
And the glory of thy people Israel.[4]

Luke sets that phrase, "a revelation to the Gentiles," in the very forefront of his Gospel.

[1] 4. 29. [2] 9. 53. [3] 23. 23. [4] 2. 29–32.

Then we turn to the middle of the Gospel and in the tenth chapter we find a fuller account of the sending out of the seventy than any other evangelist has given us; and the commentators tell us that the Jews reckoned the Gentile nations to be seventy in number, and as the twelve apostles represented the twelve tribes of Israel the seventy evangelists by their very number represented the world-wide destination of the gospel.

In the tenth chapter of the book of Genesis there is an enumeration of seventy nations, and the Jews believed that these nations represented the whole human race. Therefore, in the Talmud we find it recorded that at the feast of tabernacles the Jews offered seventy bullocks for the seventy nations, that the rain may fall on the fields of all the world.[1]

Then we turn to the end of the Gospel, and in its closing words we hear the resurrected Lord commissioning his church to preach repentance and remission of sins

[1] Lightfoot's Hor. Talm., John 7. 2.

unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.[1] In the beginning and the middle and the end of his Gospel Luke makes it clear that this revelation of good news is for *all the nations of men.*

(9) When Matthew records the choice of the twelve apostles, and lists their names, he proceeds at once to give the charge which Jesus laid upon them before he sent them forth, and the very first commandment laid upon them was this: "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.[2] Luke tells us of the sending out of the twelve and of the charge given them by the Master, but he omits any refusal of the gospel to the Gentiles or any limitation of their ministry to the Jews.[3] In the next chapter he gives a much longer and fuller account of the sending out of the seventy, and no limitations are suggested for their evangelism, while their number suggested that they might go into all the world.

[1] 24. 47. [2] Matt. 10. 5, 6. [3] 9. 1–6.

(10) Luke was the first church historian. Mark and Matthew wrote memoirs. John wrote a philosophy of religion. No other writers in the New Testament devoted themselves to narration. Luke the Gentile set himself to write a historical gospel, following Gentile models at certain points and connecting his account with Gentile history throughout. He seems to have seen clearly from the very first that the interests of Christianity were bound up with the interests of world history and that the birth of Jesus was an event of importance to the whole Roman empire. He is the only writer in the New Testament who mentions a Roman emperor by name. He joins the name of Jesus with that of the governor Quirinius and Cæsar Augustus.[1] He unites the baptism of John and the beginning ministry of Jesus with the reign of Cæsar Tiberius and the rule of Pilate and Herod and Philip and Lysanias, as well as the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas.[2]

[1] 2. 1, 2. [2] 3. 1, 2.

Almost all the connecting links between the gospel history and contemporary Gentile history are furnished us by Luke. He begins at Bethlehem, but he ends at Rome. He opens his narrative with the vision of Zacharias in the seclusion of the temple at Jerusalem, but he closes it with the preaching of the apostle Paul in the world capital. From beginning to end he is bent on showing that the gospel is a gospel for a world empire, for all nations of men, and for all the future ages of time. Van Oosterzee was right when he said, "As Paul led the people of the Lord out of the bondage to the law into the enjoyment of gospel liberty, so did Luke raise sacred history from the standpoint of the Israelitish *nationality* to the higher and holier ground of universal *humanity*."[1] We owe that to this Gentile writer. His explanations for Gentile readers, his allusions to Gentile rulers and contemporary Gentile history, his characteristic additions of Gentile prophecies and promises and parables com-

[1] Quoted by Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 659.

bine to make this the Gentile Gospel; and, surely, we Gentiles can never be grateful enough that so much of our New Testament was written from a Gentile point of view. As Paul is the apostle to the Gentiles, Luke is the evangelist for the Gentiles. The Gospel according to Luke and the book of Acts are written by a Gentile for the Gentile world.

V. The Gospel of an Educated Man

Luke is the only one of the four evangelists who had a scientific training. We would expect to see the results of that training in his writings. We think that it is apparent in his Gospel in at least four particulars: 1. In his accuracy. He tells Theophilus that he has traced the course of events accurately from the first, and that therefore Theophilus may rest assured of the certainty of these things which he finds here recorded.[1] Something of the scholar's exactness is included in the ideal of Luke, and he seems to have

[1] 1. 3, 4.

attained his ideal in a rather remarkable degree.

Modern criticism again and again has attacked the correctness of his statements, but it never has been successful in proving any serious mistake. Luke said, in Acts 17. 6, that the magistrates in Thessalonica were called politarchs, or rulers of the city. It was pointed out for many years that this title is not to be found anywhere in Greek literature, and therefore it was confidently claimed that Luke had made a mistake in using it. Yet all the while an arch was spanning the main street of the city with an inscription upon it containing the names of the seven politarchs who had erected it. When the arch was destroyed during a riot there in the last century the British consul obtained possession of its broken fragments and they are in the British Museum to-day.

Luke calls the governor of Malta the Primus, or chief man.[1] The scholars could not find this name anywhere, and so they

[1] Acts 28. 7.

were sure that Luke had made another mistake. However, an ancient inscription has been dug up in Malta with this title upon it; and Luke's accuracy has been vindicated at this point. Luke describes Philippi as a chief city of the *meris* of Macedonia.[1] Here was a new name for a district or province, and even Westcott and Hort concluded that Luke was in error in using it, and they have marked it as a doubtful reading in their text. However, since their death some ancient Macedonian coins have been discovered with this word upon them.

It is dangerous to accuse Luke of inaccuracy in anything. Time and new discoveries have proven him right and his critics wrong again and again. Illustrations could be multiplied. Such eminent modern authorities as Harnack and Ramsay rank Luke "in the first class of historians, both for trustworthiness in his details, and in his judgment for selecting the subjects which are of the first importance and must

[1] Acts 16. 12.

be treated fully. . . . We may feel confident that he showed at least the same scrupulous accuracy in reporting Christ's teachings as he did in speaking of slight secular details."[1]

Luke has tolerated no carelessness in research or in composition. He seems to be dissatisfied with the unchronological arrangement of material in the previous gospel narratives, for he assures Theophilus that he will write events in order.[2] It is probably with this intent that he concludes the account of the ministry of John the Baptist before he begins the account of the ministry of Jesus.[3] We find a chronological arrangement throughout. First, we have preliminary and introductory material (1. 1 to 4. 13). Then follows the ministry of Jesus in Galilee (4. 14 to 9. 50). Then we read of the wider ministry outside of Galilee (9. 51 to 19. 28). Then come the closing scenes in Jerusalem (19. 29 to 24. 53). This division is altogether according to time.

---

[1] Wilson, Origins and Aims of the Four Gospels, pp. 62–3.
[2] 1. 3. [3] 3. 18–20.

Luke is careful to insert the proper dates upon occasion.[1] The Greek word for "year," ἔτος, is found in the writings of Luke twenty-six times and in all the other books of the New Testament only twenty-three times. The Greek word for "month," μήν, is found in Luke's writings ten times and in all the rest of the New Testament only eight times. The more frequent occurrence of these words in his writings is an indication of Luke's desire to be more accurate in his designations of time.

2. Another result of Luke's university training is evident in his versatility. Plummer says: "The author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is the most versatile of all the New Testament writers. He can be as Hebraistic as the seventy, and as free from Hebraisms as Plutarch. And, in the main, whether intentionally or not, he is Hebraistic in describing Hebrew society, and Greek in describing Greek society."[2] It demands

---

[1] 1. 5; 2. 1, 2; 2. 21, 22; 2. 42; 3. 1, 2; 3. 23.
[2] Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. xlix.

something of both talent and training to make such transitions of style possible.

3. To accuracy and versatility we may add fluency as another evidence of higher education and broader culture. An untrained man may be very prolix in verbal statement of facts, but if he is set to write them down he is apt to make very short work of it. He is unaccustomed to the task of composition, and he finds it very difficult for him, and he confines himself to the recording of the barest outline or the main essentials. Other things being equal, facility of expression comes with practice, and an educated man will have had that practice and therefore will take more pleasure in literary composition. He will be ready to fill out the more meager outline and to add interesting details to the essential features of the narrative. He will give us a fuller and more symmetrical account. When we compare the Gospel according to Luke with the other synoptics we find these things to be true of it.

(1) It is a more comprehensive account.

It begins with the birth of the Forerunner and all the interesting events connected therewith. The contents of the first two chapters are peculiar to Luke. Mark began with the active ministry of John the Baptist. Matthew told us about the birth of Jesus. Luke goes back of these events to find the beginning of the new dispensation in the prophecy of the birth of John. Then Luke carries his narrative beyond that of any of the other Gospels. He is the only one who gives us any account of the ascension of Jesus, which would surely seem to be the only fitting end for such a career as that of the Incarnate One. In the middle of his Gospel Luke has given us a large section—9. 45 to 18. 30—the most of the material in which is peculiar to him. The other Gospels pass these events over in silence, and yet some of them are among the most remarkable in our Lord's ministry. This section is usually called "the greater insertion" in the gospel narrative. Schleiermacher called it "the journey account."

Others have named it the "Gnomology." Altogether, about one third of the contents of Luke is not to be found in the other Gospels.

(2) As the most comprehensive account, the Gospel according to Luke is the longest of the four Gospels. It has been calculated that when the contents of the synoptic Gospels have been divided into one hundred and seventy-two sections Luke has one hundred and twenty-seven, or about three fourths of these; Matthew has one hundred and fourteen, or about two thirds; and Mark has eighty-four, or about one half; and of these one hundred and seventy-two sections Luke has forty-eight, or about two sevenths peculiar to himself; Matthew has twenty-two, or about one eighth; and Mark has five, or about one thirty-seventh.

(3) There are twenty miracles recorded in this Gospel, and six of these are peculiar to Luke. These are: The miraculous draught of fishes,[1] the raising of the widow's son at Nain,[2] the healing of the woman bowed

[1] 5. 4–11. [2] 7. 11–17.

together,[1] the cure of the dropsical man,[2] the cleansing of the ten lepers[3], the restoration of Malchus's ear.[4] Over against these six miracles peculiar to Luke, Matthew has only three peculiar to himself, and Mark has only two. Luke, therefore, has more than Matthew and Mark combined.

(4) There are twenty-three parables recorded in this Gospel, and of these eighteen are peculiar to Luke. These are: The two debtors,[5] the good Samaritan,[6] the importunate friend,[7] the rich fool,[8] the watchful servants,[9] the barren fig tree,[10] the chief seats,[11] the great supper,[12] the rash builder,[13] the rash king,[14] the lost coin,[15] the lost son,[16] the unrighteous steward,[17] the rich man and Lazarus,[18] the unprofitable servants,[19] the unjust judge,[20] the Pharisee and publican,[21] the pounds.[22] Over against these eighteen parables peculiar to

[1] 13. 10–17. [2] 14. 1–7. [3] 17. 11–19. [4] 22. 50, 51.
[5] 7. 41–43. [6] 10. 25–37. [7] 11. 5–8. [8] 12. 16–21.
[9] 12. 35–48. [10] 13. 6–9. [11] 14. 7–11. [12] 14. 16–24.
[13] 14. 28–30. [14] 14. 31, 32. [15] 15. 3–10. [16] 15. 11–32.
[17] 16. 1–13. [18] 16. 19–31. [19] 17. 7–10. [20] 18. 1–8.
[21] 18. 10–14. [22] 19. 11–27.

Luke, Matthew has only ten and Mark has only one. Therefore Luke has over a third more than Matthew and Mark combined.

These parables seem to be of quite a different character from those in the other synoptics. The parables in the first Gospel had to do chiefly with the kingdom and its laws. The parables in the Gospel according to Luke have an individual and purely human interest. They are more personal and more concrete. They do not seem so much like types of spiritual phenomena as they do like transcripts from actual life. They are not so much concerned with analogies from nature as they are with accurate accounts of human nature. They do not idealize human nature. They represent it as it actually is. They are more like snapshots at contemporary occurrences. They are stories based on fact. They have to do with real men and women and the common things of daily life.

What testimony they bear to the freshness and originality of the conversation of

Jesus! Some of these parables are spoken spontaneously in answer to some question put at him unexpectedly. He must have had a very ready wit and very unusual powers of observation to produce such apt illustrations of his truth at a moment's notice. No wonder the common people heard him gladly. He talked about things that they knew, and showed them hidden depths of wisdom where they had seen only the utterly commonplace. These parables would go home to the hearts of all. They showed the way of salvation from the materials close at hand. The truth embodied in these tales could be appreciated by anyone. Their simplicity was their chief charm. Their homeliness was one element of their power.

(5) Of the interesting narratives peculiar to Luke we may mention as examples the events connected with the birth of John the Baptist and of Jesus, including the annunciation, the story of the shepherds, the meeting with Simeon and with Anna,[1]

[1] 1. 5 to 2. 40.

the temple visit at the age of twelve,[1] the scene in the synagogue at Nazareth,[2] the feast in the home of Simon the Pharisee,[3] the intolerance of James and John,[4] the story of Martha and Mary,[5] the story of Zacchæus,[6] the story of the penitent thief,[7] and the story of the walk to Emmaus.[8] The mere mention of these narratives and miracles and parables makes it evident at once that the greater length of the third Gospel is not due to any mere padding or prolixity; for these things belong to the most precious portions of the record of the life and teaching of our Lord. Yet the longest Gospel might have been due to a greater abundance of material on hand or to a greater abundance of leisure for writing. The final and crowning test of an educated man's composition will be found in his literary style. To accuracy, versatility, fluency does Luke add beauty of literary style?

4. Renan says that this is "the most

---

[1] 2. 41–52. [2] 4. 16–30. [3] 7. 36–50. [4] 9. 49–54.
[5] 10. 38–42. [6] 19. 1–10. [7] 23. 40–43. [8] 24. 13–35.

literary of the Gospels," and he adds that it is "a beautiful narrative, well contrived, at once Hebraic and Hellenic, uniting the emotion of the drama with the serenity of the idyl."[1]

Notice (1) the language Luke employs. It is the most beautiful Greek in the New Testament, with the possible exception of that found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Luke is less Hebraic than the other evangelists. His first two chapters have a stronger Hebraic coloring than any other portion of the New Testament, and this is a proof either of Luke's personal versatility or of his faithful reproduction of some Hebraic original of this part of his narrative. When he is Hebraic he is thoroughly so; but when he writes Greek it is better Greek than the other evangelists could command; and where he is most independent of all previous effort, as in the preface to his own narrative, his Greek is of the finest quality and merits comparison with the best of the classical

[1] Renan, *op. cit*, p. 282.

models. Taking the Gospel as a whole, its Greek will be found to stand about midway between the classical perfection of the ancients and the common, or Hellenistic, Greek of Luke's day. It is the Greek of an educated man as distinguished from the current Greek of ordinary use.

Notice (2) that Luke has the richest vocabulary of any of the gospel writers. The words peculiar to Luke in the New Testament are variously estimated, according to various readings of the text, from seven hundred and fifty to eight hundred and fifty-one; and in the Gospel from two hundred and sixty-one to three hundred and twelve of these occur. The richness of a man's vocabulary is usually a very fair measure of the degree of his culture. The uneducated man has a very limited fund of words at his command. The well-read and well-trained man is continually adding to his supply.

Notice (3) the very effective contrasts which are characteristic of Luke's grouping of his material. All through the Gospel

we find two opposing characters set side by side, that we may see them together and mark the difference between them. There are the two annunciations in the beginning, to Zacharias slow to believe and to Mary the instantly obedient. Then follow such contrasts as those offered by Simon and the sinful woman, Martha and Mary, the ungrateful Jewish lepers and the grateful Samaritan, the unneighborly Levite and priest and the neighborly Samaritan, the Pharisee and the publican, the rich man and Lazarus, the prodigal and his elder brother, the sleepy and surly friend and the sleepless and gracious God, the unjust judge and the loving Father of all, the hostile priesthood and the hearkening people, the work of Jesus and the work of the devil, and the blessings and the woes of the Sermon on the Plain.

Sanday says that Luke has more literary ambition than his fellows.[1] Ramsay declares that he "brings to the treatment of his subjects genius, literary skill, and sym-

[1] Book by Book, p. 401.

pathetic historical insight." Plummer says: "He possesses the art of composition. He knows not only how to tell a tale truthfully, but how to tell it with effect. . . . As the fine literary taste of Renan affirms, it is the most beautiful book in the world."[1]

VI. The Gospel of the Physician

If Paul had not told us that Luke was a physician we could have been assured of it from the internal evidence afforded in his writing. 1. This is apparent in his frequent references to the healing work of Jesus.[2]

2. Luke is the only one of the evangelists to record the surgical miracle of the healing of Malchus's ear.[3]

3. Of the six miracles recorded by Luke alone, five are miracles of healing, if we include among them the raising of the widow's son at Nain.[4] The four others are, the healing of the woman who had a spirit of infirmity for eighteen years,[5]

---

[1] Plummer, *op. cit.*, xlvi. [2] 4. 18; 9. 1; 9. 2; 9. 6; 10. 9.
[3] 22. 51. [4] 7. 11–17. [5] 13. 10–17.

and of the man afflicted with the dropsy,[1] the cleansing of the ten lepers,[2] and the restoration of Malchus's mutilated ear.[3]

4. Luke alone quotes the proverb from the lips of Jesus, "Physician, heal thyself";[4] and he tells us that Jesus declared that this title of "Physician" would be popularly applied to him in his work.

5. Luke is more circumstantial in his description of diseases than any other writer in the New Testament, as in Luke 4. 8; 5. 12; 22. 44; Acts 3. 7; 9. 18; 10. 9, 10; 12. 23; 28. 8.

6. Luke frequently gives us the symptoms of disease and the duration of the sickness, and marks for us the stages of the patient's recovery. He seems to distinguish between cases of possession and ordinary forms of physical infirmity, as in 6. 17, 18.

7. It has been noted that the Gospel of the physician is also the Gospel of the psychologist. Where Mark tells us only about outward actions and looks, Luke

[1] 14. 1–6. [2] 17. 11–19. [3] 22. 51. [4] 4. 23.

makes some comment concerning the mental attitude involved, as in 3. 15; 6. 11; 7. 39. A skillful physician will look beyond external symptoms to the mental phenomena. It is characteristic of our own age that more attention than formerly was believed necessary is now given to the state of the mind in the treatment of all disease. But all first-class physicians have always been more or less interested in psychology as an aid in their work; and Luke appears to have belonged in this class.

Strange and unexpected touches occur in Luke's narrative, corresponding to the astonishing and inexplicable psychological experiences of ordinary life. Peter is amazed at the wonder-working power displayed by the Lord in the miraculous draught of fishes, and he is never more determined to cleave to this new Master through sunshine and storm. Yet what does he do? The most foolish and inexplicable thing. He falls at the knees of Jesus and cries, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man,

O Lord."[1] How could Jesus depart from him? They were in a boat, out on the water. It was not convenient for anyone to leave that boat just at that moment. Moreover, Peter did not wish for Jesus to depart anyway. It would have been more becoming for him to go away, if anybody had to leave, than for him to order the Master to depart from him. It was all utterly foolish and inexcusable, just as the psychological processes of such a mind as Peter's so often are.

The risen Lord appeared among his disciples, and showed them his hands and his feet, that they might be convinced of his identity. It is Luke who puts down that extraordinary statement at that point. "They yet believed not for joy."[2] What a natural touch that was! They believed it, and yet it was too good to be true.

The Lord had ascended into heaven, and the disciples were to see him no more. Luke makes that statement of fact and then ends the book with the astonishing

[1] 5. 8, 9. [2] 24. 41.

comment that the disciples "worshiped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually in the temple, blessing God."[1] No loud lamentation, no rending of their garments, no forty-day period of mourning; nothing but praise and joy!

8. There is an indication that the writer of the third Gospel and the book of Acts is a physician which is all-sufficient in itself, and which has seemed to most people to be altogether conclusive in the matter. These books are filled with technical medical terms, such as can be paralleled only in the writings of men in the medical profession itself. The Rev. W. K. Hobart has written a volume of more than three hundred pages entitled The Medical Language of Luke, in which he has made a list of some four hundred terms used more frequently by Luke than by others, or used by Luke alone among the writers of the New Testament, and found also in the Greek medical writers. Some of these are

[1] 24. 52, 53.

purely technical terms, not likely to be in use anywhere except in professional circles.[1] In 18. 25, where Mark and Matthew have the more common word for "needle," *ῥαφίς*, Luke uses the word for the surgical needle, *βελόνη*. In Acts 13. 11 Luke uses a word for a disease of the eye, occurring frequently in Galen, but found nowhere else in our New Testament or the Septuagint, *ἀχλύς*.

Of course, all people are apt to use medical phraseology sometimes. The apostle Paul has many medical metaphors in his epistles. It has been an interesting subject for discussion and investigation as to how far Paul's companionship with Luke the physician may have been responsible for these medical terms in his usage. However, no one is apt to use these medical terms and phrases continually except a medical man. Such a man will use them, not only in the technical description of disease, but even in reference to the affairs of ordinary life. Now, the abundance of

[1] 4. 38, 39; 16. 19–26.

the medical terms in the third Gospel distinguishes it from all the others as the work of a physician, and nearly one hundred of these terms are such as only a physician might be expected to use.

Harnack gives pages of evidence on this subject which he sums up in these words: "When a physician writes a historical work it does not necessarily follow that his profession shows itself in his writing; yet it is only natural for one to look for traces of the author's medical profession in such a work. These traces may be of different kinds: (1) the whole character of the narrative may be determined by points of view, aims, and ideals which are more or less medical (disease and its treatment); (2) marked preference may be shown for stories concerning the healing of diseases, which stories may be given in great number and detail; (3) the language may be colored by the language of physicians (medical technical terms, metaphors of medical character, etc.). All these three groups of characteristic signs are found in the his-

torical work which bears the name of Luke. Here, however, it may be objected that the subject-matter itself is responsible for these traits, so that their evidence is not decisive for the medical calling of the author. Jesus appeared as a great physician and healer. All the evangelists say this of him; hence it is not surprising that one of them has set this phase of his ministry in the foreground, and has regarded it as the most important. Our evangelist need not, therefore, have been a physician, especially if he were a Greek, seeing that in those days Greeks with religious interests were disposed to regard religion mainly under the category of healing and salvation. This is true; yet such a combination of characteristic signs will compel us to believe that the author was a physician if (4) the description of the particular cases of disease shows distinct traces of medical diagnosis and scientific knowledge; (5) if the language, even where questions of medicine or of healing are not touched upon, is colored by medical phraseology;

and (6) if in those passages where the author speaks as an eyewitness medical traits are especially and prominently apparent. These three kinds of tokens are also found in the historical work of our author. It is, accordingly, proved that it proceeds from the pen of a physician."[1] This puts the truth as clearly as it may be stated. Those who are interested in the proof in detail will find it in the pages of Hobart and Harnack.

9. With these facts in mind it is interesting to notice one difference between Mark's account and Luke's account of the woman who was healed by touching the hem of the garment of Jesus. Mark tells us that "she had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse."[2] That, surely, is a bad showing for the medical profession. Would Luke be likely to write down such an indictment of his own calling in life? We turn to his account[3] and we find that in the Vatican

[1] Harnack, Luke the Physician, pp. 175, 176. [2] 5. 25, 26. [3] 8. 43.

manuscript and the Westcott and Hort text and the margin of the Revised Version Luke omits all these severe reflections upon the physicians and contents himself with the simple statement, "She was not able to be healed by any." This is hardly an adequate translation. What Luke really means to say is that the woman lacked all vital energy in herself, so that she seemed to be beyond the hope of any favorable response to medical treatment. It was a case of chronic debility so pronounced that nothing seemed to be left for a physician to build upon. It was not the fault of the physicians that she could not be cured. It was her own condition that seemed incurable. Luke, the physician, would not have been likely to write any of those things recorded by Mark. Some of the old manuscripts retain the clause in the text of Luke, "and she had spent all her living upon physicians," but it is better to omit it, as Westcott and Hort have done.

10. We notice in closing this list of the evidences in the writings of Luke that they

are the product of one who represents the point of view of the medical profession, that almost the last words Luke has written at the close of the book of Acts consist of a quotation from Isaiah ending with the words, "and I will heal them."[1] It is the healing power of Jehovah upon which he lays emphasis last. Here, then, we have a list of ten of the direct evidences of his professional calling to be found in the writings of Luke. They are cumulative in effect, and, taking them all together, we are disposed to be exceedingly glad that one of our Gospels was written by a Gentile, and that he was an educated man and that his profession was that of a physician.

When we turn from the direct evidences to those which are more indirect we find this feeling enhanced. A physician, like an evangelist or any true minister of the gospel, must be no respecter of persons. He must be interested in all classes alike, and must devote himself to the helping and

[1] 28. 27.

healing of all. But there is one class in which the physician as a professional man is more interested than the lawyer or the preacher or any other servant of society. That is the class of the very young.

The physician ought to be expert in the diseases of infancy. It is a part of his duty to help the little ones through the period of their greatest helplessness and infirmity into good health and vigorous physical life. The sympathy and love of the physician's heart goes out continually to the innocent and helpless lambs of the flock. Now, it surely is characteristic of the third Gospel that more than the others it is interested in the little folks.

VII. The Gospel of Childhood

1. Luke alone tells us about the birth and infancy of John the Baptist, and all the marvels connected with it, the annunciation to Zacharias in the temple, the paralysis of the tongue of that unbeliever, the miraculous quickening of Elisabeth in her old age, the restoration of the power of

speech to Zacharias at the time of the birth of his son, and the use he made of it in singing a psalm of praise to God. This birth in old age, this temporary dumbness, and this loosening of a paralyzed tongue are all of interest to the physician as well as to the writer of the gospel history.

2. Matthew tells us something about the birth of Jesus, but Luke adds the story of the annunciation to Mary, the visit to Elisabeth, the singing of the Magnificat, the heralding of the heavenly host, the visit of the shepherds, the circumcision, the purification, the meeting with Simeon and Anna, the child's growth in wisdom and stature and grace, and the twelve-year-old boy's interest in the temple and its teachers of the law.

3. Mark and Matthew told us how they brought little children to Jesus, but Luke tells us that these little ones were babes, *τὰ βρέφη*. They were innocent, helpless, clinging, dependent, trustful infants in their mothers' arms of whom Jesus said,

"To such belongeth the kingdom of God."[1] The first two chapters of the third Gospel will always be the chapters we will most delight to read to the children and the chapters which the children will be most delighted to hear. They will always love best the Gospel with the story of the shepherds and the angels, the Gospel which tells how Jesus allowed the mothers to bring their babies to him, the Gospel written by the beloved physician who loved the little folks and so thought it worth while to write a part of his story for them.

VIII. The Gospel of Womanhood

A physician because of his profession is brought into more confidential relations with women than any other professional man is likely to be. A lawyer probably will deal most of the time with men. A minister ought to be interested equally in the men and the women of his community. But since, apart from helpless infancy,

[1] Luke 18. 15–17.

woman physically is the weaker vessel, a physician is apt to find that the most of his time and attention is occupied with the care of women and children; and if he is of a naturally kindly disposition he will find his sympathies going out to these in large measure, and as he becomes beloved and trusted, he will find that their confidence is given to him as to no other professional man. The third Gospel has many items of intimate information concerning women which may have come to Luke in this way. There is such a number of these that the third Gospel has come to be called the "Gospel of Womanhood." We note some of the reasons for giving it this title.

1. Luke tells us more about women than the other synoptics combined. The word γυνή, "woman," occurs in Mark and Matthew forty-nine times, and in Luke alone forty-three times, almost as many times as in the two others put together. The pages of this Gospel are filled with the figures of women, and some of them are not to be found in the other Gospels at all.

2. We are indebted to Luke alone for much of our information concerning the Virgin Mary. The old tradition which declared that Luke was a painter, and that he had painted the portrait of the Virgin Mary, was not so far wrong after all, for it is from the pages of Luke that we are able to reproduce any satisfying portrait of the Virgin Mary to-day. Mark mentioned her name, and Matthew told us something about the trouble she had with Joseph, who was minded to put her away; but it is in Luke's narrative alone that we are permitted to see the events circling about the birth of the God-Man from the standpoint of the human mother involved in the great mystery. Luke alone tells us about the annunciation to Mary, and we have a glimpse of that moment of transcendent revelation to the Virgin who was to bear a Child, some inkling of the profound perplexity into which she was inevitably thrown, some conception of the absolute sublimity of self-surrender to that sword which was to pierce her soul and to that

exaltation over all womankind forevermore.

Luke has pictured for us Mary the maid and Mary the mother as the type of perfect womanhood. She has been worshiped by multitudes of Christians, and she has been reverenced by all the disciples of Jesus as the pure Virgin who bore our Lord and the saintly mother who trained the Child in the ways of righteousness in the Nazareth home. In Luke we see Mary hastening away to her kinswoman, Elisabeth, that she may pour into the ear of that older and trusted friend all her tale of high favor and great grief. In Luke we hear Mary singing the Magnificat, that spontaneous outburst of the maiden's overflowing thanksgiving to God:

My soul doth magnify the Lord,
And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.
For he hath looked upon the low estate of his handmaid:
For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.[1]

[1] 1. 46-48.

In Luke alone we have a glimpse of the mother laying the Child in the manger and receiving the shepherds with modest dignity and listening to their tale of angel messages and songs, and then treasuring these things in her heart through all the long days and years. In Luke we see her in the temple, bringing the appointed sacrifice of the poor, and meeting Simeon and Anna, and hearing the prophecy of her own woe and the redemption to be accomplished through her son. In Luke we read of Mary searching through the caravan and then through the sacred city for the twelve-year-old Boy who had strangely disappeared, but who told her when he had been discovered that the temple was the only place in which they need have looked for him. Then we read again that Mary kept all these sayings in her heart.

Tradition said that Luke painted the portrait of Mary and carried it with him in his evangelistic labors, and that miracles were wrought by means of it, and that it greatly helped him in his preaching. It

has been an aid to gospel preaching through all the centuries that Luke has given us in this book the picture of this maid and mother who serves as a type of model womanhood. But there are other women in these pages besides this mother of our Lord.

3. Luke tells us all that we know about the cousin of the Virgin Mary, the saintly Elisabeth, the one to whom the Virgin turned first for confidence and consolation in the hour of her great trouble and joy.

4. Luke tells us about the saintly prophetess Anna, one of the quiet of the land, worshiping and fasting and praying night and day in the temple and waiting for the coming of the Lord. There they stand in those first two chapters: the saintly Virgin, the saintly wife, and the saintly widow—Mary, Elisabeth, Anna—bearing their witness that now a new gospel to saintly womanhood had come into the world.

5. Luke tells us of that company of women who ministered of their substance to the twelve and their Master, because they had been healed of evil spirits and

infirmities—Mary of Magdala, Joanna, Susanna, and many others.[1] It is Luke alone who gives us this picture of Jesus, "accompanied in his mission journeys—not by warriors like David, not by elders like Moses, not by kings and princes like the Herods—but by a most humble band of ministering women."[2] "The Teacher who included in his church the humble, the distressed, and the repentant, is attended by the weak and loving rather than by a council of elders, a band of warriors, or a school of prophets."[3] "The scribes and Pharisees gathered up their robes in the streets and the synagogues, lest they should touch a woman, and held it a crime to look on an unveiled woman in public; our Lord suffered a woman to minister to him out of whom he had cast seven devils."[4]

6. Luke has given us that picture of the visit of Jesus to the home of Martha and Mary, and a glimpse at the typically different characters of those two sister disciples.[5]

---

[1] 8. 2, 3. [2] Farrar, Messages of the Books, p. 81.
[3] Bishop Westcott. [4] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 663. [5] 10. 38–42.

7. Luke tells us of the widow of Nain and how the coming of Jesus turned her mourning into joy. The Lord had compassion upon her and said to her, "Weep not."[1]

8. The evangelist Luke has recorded the parable of the importunate widow and the unjust judge.[2] These three widows—Anna, praying in the temple; the weeping widow at Nain; the impatient, persistent, pestiferous widow of the parable—appear in the third Gospel alone and are in themselves sufficient to make this "Gospel of Womanhood" a "Gospel of Widowhood" as well. A worshiping widow, a weeping widow, a wrangling widow; a saintly widow, a sorrowing widow, an insufferable widow; a widow eighty-four years in saintly and patient expectation of the coming of her Lord, an unfortunate widow mourning the loss of her only son, an importunate widow in as full contrast with the quiet and patient saints of the Lord as the unjust judge is in contrast with the loving and

[1] 7. 11–15. [2] 18. 1–8.

patient Father of all. We owe the pictures of these three widows to Luke alone.

9. Luke tells us of the healing of that daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound for eighteen years.[1] The ruler of the synagogue was moved with great indignation that day, but Jesus lifted the burden from that woman's shoulders, loosened the bonds that had bowed her together for years, and permitted her to stand straight and glorify God before them all. The miracle might be taken as a parable of the change Christianity has wrought in the condition of womanhood in the world. Woman is no longer bound and bowed; at the word of Jesus she stands straight. Wherever the ministry of Jesus has come she has been made to glorify God.

10. Luke has given us that story of the anointing of Jesus by the woman who had been a sinner, at the feast in the house of Simon the Pharisee.[2] Could we lose out of the gospel story the parable of the two

[1] 13. 10–17. [2] 7. 36–50.

debtors and this whole picture of the relation between our compassionate Lord and all truly repentant souls? This woman had sinned, but her love had won forgiveness; she had sinned, but his love had made her clean. He accepted the sacrifice her affection was so willing to make; he did not repulse her before the throng; he acknowledged their previous relationship; he promised her that she might go in peace. There is all the union of purity and compassion, of dignity and genuine affection which we would expect to find in the loving Saviour of men. Luke alone has given us this narrative.[1]

11. In the other Gospels we read how Jesus defended himself against the blasphemous charge of the Pharisees that he was in league with Beelzebub, but it is Luke alone who records the fact that at the close of that defense some warm-hearted woman in the throng lifted up her voice impulsively in defiance of his ene-

[1] For the reasons for concluding that this narrative has no parallel in the other Gospels, see Andrews, The Life of Our Lord, pp. 281–286.

mies and in utter loyalty to him, saying, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck."[1] It was a blessing pronounced upon Mary the mother, but it was a woman's tribute to the greatness and the goodness of Mary's Son.

12. Luke tells us that on the way to the cross a multitude of women followed him, weeping and lamenting his fate; but Jesus turned to them and said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children."[2] His compassion for the women and for the little ones was dominant within him to the very last.

13. Epiphanius tells us that in Marcion's version of the Gospel according to Luke he had inserted as a part of the charge made by the Jews against Jesus in the trial before Pilate, "This man perverts the women and the children." The insertion bears its witness to the attraction which the personality of Jesus must have always had

[1] 11. 27. [2] 23. 27, 28.

for these more dependent classes of society. The children loved him and followed him. The women ministered to him gladly of their substance. Doubtless there were some of the Jews who thought it would be better for their wives to stay at home and to learn from their husbands in silence and seclusion and subjection there rather than to be running about the country after this new teacher and squandering their means in the support of him and his able-bodied but idle attendants. Doubtless there were some fathers who wondered why their children did not run to them so gladly and listen to them so eagerly as they did to this stranger; and it must have seemed to them that their families were being perverted, and it would be just as well for this man to be put out of the way. They were right in thinking that a revolution was impending in those days. They were wrong in thinking that the death of Jesus would put an end to it.

The rights of childhood had been recognized once for all. The emancipation of

womanhood had been proclaimed for all time to come. The Saviour of the world was to be the Saviour of women and the Saviour of the little ones. Henceforth they would follow him into the kingdom of God. The beloved physician has given us in his Gospel this picture of the compassionate Christ, interested like himself in these weaker and more helpless members of society, and beloved like himself by those to whom he gave his ceaseless sympathy and service.

IX. The Gospel for the Poor

A good physician is ready to respond to any cry of need. His professional knowledge is at the service of all. He can be no respecter of persons in his practice. He must give as much attention to the needs of his poor patients as he does to the rich. A beloved physician will be a philanthropist, a lover of man as man. The physician who works only for fat fees and who goes only when summoned by the well-to-do may make his fortune, but he will miss

his greatest professional opportunity in the service of the poor. The poor people are in the majority, and when they are sick their need of a good physician is greater than that of the comfortably rich. With unskillful nursing and unsanitary surroundings and unwholesome food all the resources of the physician are taxed to the utmost to save the life; and a good physician finds that his sympathies are poured out in the effort to help the needy poor.

Luke was such a good physician. He lived and died a poor man, and he gave the most of his service to the poor. He is naturally interested to show that the gospel news he has to record is of immediate concern to the most needy classes, and among these to the humble and the poor. He says so much about these that this third Gospel has been called the Gospel of the Ebionites, the Ebionites deriving their name from the Hebrew word *Ebion*, "poor." Let us notice a few of the facts which lead to such a conclusion.

1. The angel Gabriel is sent to make the

annunciation of the Messiah's birth, not to any royal palace, not to any mansion of the rich, but to a plainly furnished and poverty-stricken peasant's home. There to a humble maiden of the multitude of the poor in the land was his message given that the Messias would come. Luke alone has recorded that scene.[1]

2. Mary went to see her kinswoman, Elisabeth, and there she sang her Magnificat:

> He hath put down princes from their thrones,
> And hath exalted them of low degree.
> The hungry he hath filled with good things;
> And the rich he hath sent empty away.[2]

Luke alone has recorded the song.

3. Luke alone tells us how this marvelous birth took place. He says that the Saviour was born in a stable. He says that the Messias was laid in a manger. He says that the Incarnate God could find no room in the inn.[3] Was this the way for the King of kings and the Lord of lords to enter upon his inheritance?

[1] 1. 26–38. [2] 1. 52, 53. [3] 2. 7.

On the fifth of September, 1639, a son was born to Louis XIII, king of France. The birth took place at the castle of Saint Germain, where Anne of Austria, queen of France, then resided. For weeks before the neighboring town had been crowded with the noble and the great, who were impatiently waiting the wished-for event. Every avenue up to the palace was thronged with the anxious and interested people. On that day, the fifth of September, the king summoned into his private apartment the princes and the princesses of the blood royal. In the next room the bishops of Lisieux, Meaux, and Beauvais were stationed. Across the hallway were the officers of state and ladies of rank sufficient to give them the right of entrance to the royal palace. At last the nurse appeared with the newborn son, afterward Louis the XIVth of France. The father took the infant child and held it up at the window where the waiting crowd might see. They shouted aloud their joy while the happy king carried the baby prince into the room

where the bishops were offering up prayers, and the boy was baptized by the Bishop of Meaux in the presence of all the great dignitaries of the kingdom. The news was at once dispatched to the city of Paris, and the great capital celebrated the event with magnificent festivities. In due time there arrived a nuncio extraordinary from the Pope, with swaddling clothes blessed by "His Holiness" there at Rome and sent to the Dauphin of France as one of the elder sons of the church. Those swaddling clothes were laid in two chests of red velvet and were sparkling with silver and gold. A sovereign prince had been born, the heir to one of Europe's foremost thrones, and round about this royal birth were gathered the pomp and pageantry, the imposing ceremony and regal luxury that befitted the welcoming of him who was to be the king.

Luke alone has told us how the world welcomed the coming of him who was to be the King of kings on that night of his birth in Bethlehem. Bethlehem took no

notice; it was interested in far different things. The capital city, Jerusalem, knew nothing about it and did not care. The ecclesiastical authorities were busied about other matters. The noble and the great, the wealthy and the influential, were sound asleep and utterly unconscious of any great event. The people in the inn were making the best of their crowded quarters and were snoring their satisfaction that they could get lodgings at such a time as this.

There was nobody out in the stable except that poor maid who had come too late or who was too poor to procure any room in the inn. There among the stable smells Jesus was born, and they laid him to rest in the manger, a little nest of a bed having been hollowed out for him in the cattle straw. There were no swaddling clothes there, blessed by high dignitaries and sparkling with jewels. His swaddling clothes were such as that poor mother could furnish in the hour of her need. Matthew tells about the coming of Wise Men from the East, bringing rich presents

of gold and frankincense and myrrh and offering the homage that was due to a King. There is nothing of that sort in Luke's narrative. The only courtiers here are the cattle. Jesus is born in the extremest poverty of surroundings. It has been said that the shortest biography of Jesus ever written was that in which the apostle Paul expressed the bald fact and the whole astonishing truth of the incarnation in one word, ἐπτώχευσεν, He became poor.[1] It is Luke who has given us the historical setting for this assertion in his story of the Saviour's birth.

4. In Matthew's story the Magi appear in Jerusalem and make inquiry of the king in his palace and of the scribes who were the masters of the law. The news is thus given in the capital and to the chief rulers of the nation. In Luke no such public proclamation takes place. The only people who are told about this transcendent mystery of the incarnation are some shepherd lads, keeping watch by night over

[1] 2 Cor. 8. 9.

their flocks on the Bethlehem hills. Those poor fellows had no gifts to bring to Mary or to Jesus, but they heard the good news of great joy which should be to all people and they spread that news among the poor people everywhere.[1]

5. According to Luke, who has made the only record of them, later revelations were accorded to some quiet and obscure people, Simeon and Anna,[2] not to Augustus at Rome, nor to Annas, the high priest at Jerusalem.

6. Luke is careful to tell us that when the days of purification were ended, and the parents made their sacrifice in the temple, they offered a pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons, the sacrifice of the very poor.[3]

7. Luke alone tells us that when John the Baptist came preaching he said to the multitudes, "He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise."[4] John the Baptist believed that the sharing of

[1] 2. 8–20. [2] 2. 25–38. [3] 2. 22–24. [4] 3. 11.

superfluities in practical philanthropy would solve the problem of the poor, or, at least, it would help to solve the problem of the equitable distribution of wealth.

8. When Jesus was ready to begin his ministry Luke records his first sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth, and he says that the first words that Jesus uttered were these:

> The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
> Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor.[1]

According to Luke, the gospel of Jesus is a gospel to the poor. That text from Isaiah was the fitting motto for the beginning and the middle and the end of his ministry. It summarized the whole of his mission to men.

9. In Luke 14. 33 we find Jesus saying, "Whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple"; and Luke alone has recorded the fact that when Jesus called Peter and Andrew and James and John and Matthew

[1] 4. 18.

into his service they all of them left all and followed him.[1]

10. Where Matthew has written the Beatitude of our Lord, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," Luke has it, "Blessed are ye poor";[2] and where Matthew has written, "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness," Luke has it, "Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled."[3] Where Matthew has only Beatitudes, Luke adds some "Woes"—"Woe unto you that are rich!"[4] and, "Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger."[5]

11. Luke records the parable of Dives and Lazarus, in which the poor beggar has the advantage at last.[6]

12. Luke has the parable of the rich fool, who labored long and gained much and lost everything in one night, including his soul.[7] Was there ever such a vivid picture of utter selfishness put into so brief a form? Look at the possessive pronouns, "*my*

---

[1] 5. 11, 28. [2] 6. 20. [3] 6. 21. [4] 6. 24.
[5] 6. 25. [6] 16. 19–31. [7] 12. 16–21.

fruits, *my* barns, *my* grain, *my* goods, *my* soul." No one of those things belonged to him, least of all his soul. That was taken away from him in one night, and then to whom did all the other things belong? Look at the personal pronouns, "What shall *I* do? This will *I* do. Then *I* will say to my soul." He will say, will he? There are seven of these future tenses in the Greek, all showing how happy he is going to be in some future day. They are followed by six present tenses, all utterly selfish, but all postponed to that future day which never dawned. "I *will* say, Eat, drink, rest, rejoice"; but he never lived to say it, much less really to do any of these things.

13. Luke also has that parable about the chief seats at the feast, closing with the promise, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted."[1]

14. Luke tells us of that great supper to which the "poor and maimed and blind and lame" were invited.[2] It is a symbol of

[1] 14. 7–11. [2] 14. 21.

the gospel feast set forth in all these pages written by Luke. It is all for the poor and for the poorest of the poor. Luke is ready to go out into the highways and the hedges and constrain these impoverished and neglected ones to come in. By way of contrast, remember what Voltaire said to D'Alembert: "We have never pretended to enlighten the cobblers and the maid-servants. We leave that for the apostles." That is the work in which Paul delighted. That is the work to which Luke devoted himself. Jesus was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor. The gospel of his anointed ones will be, like this Gospel according to Luke, a gospel of comfort and encouragement and salvation to the poor.

It may be well to suggest, before leaving this subject, that while Luke evidently had an overflowing sympathy for the poor, his book does not lead us to think that he had any prejudice against wealth as such, any more than Jesus had. Riches never harmed a man unless he tried to find his happiness in them. If he allowed them to

stand between him and the kingdom, they made him infinitely poor. That seemed to be the case with the rich young ruler. He would not follow Jesus if he must forsake his wealth. He preferred earthly substance to his soul's salvation. That was a fatal choice. He trusted to his riches for his supreme satisfaction and he went away sorrowful rather than satisfied.

It was not because he was rich that he could not be saved. It was because he trusted in riches more than in a Redeemer. A poor man can do that as well as a rich man. A poor man can feel sure that if he had riches he could take care of himself, and if he trusts in riches to that extent the wealth he has not can keep him out of the kingdom. Jesus said, "Children, how hard is it for *them that trust in riches* to enter into the kingdom of God!" And that warning was as applicable to those poor disciples as to any others. They, too, must put their trust in God rather than in mammon, in order to be saved. Wealth never saved a man, and wealth just as surely never

damned a man. It is the use of wealth that determines its relation to a man's character.

1. In the parable Abraham is in bliss, and Abraham presumably was just as rich a man upon earth as the rich man whom the parable shows us in torments. The difference between Abraham and Dives was not one of wealth, but one of character.

2. Luke alone tells us about Zacchæus, and we learn that Zacchæus was a very wealthy man; and when he decides to keep half of his possessions there is no hint that either Jesus or Luke thought that he ought to have given up all.

3. In the various discussions throughout the Gospel concerning masters and servants there is no suggestion that it is wrong to have servants, and in one passage the Master plainly says that he who sits at meat is superior to him who serves,[1] but it is a kind of superiority which he himself does not desire.

4. Possibly Luke is more insistent than

[1] 22. 27.

either Matthew or Mark upon the fact that Joseph of Arimathæa, while a rich man and a man of high rank, was also a good and righteous man, and one who was looking for the kingdom of God.[1]

These indications are sufficient to show that wealth turned to good uses was appreciated to the full by Luke and by his Lord. They were both of them glad enough that there were some women who were well-to-do and able to minister of their substance to the Master and his apostles in the days of their need. They preferred to preach and be poor themselves, but they had no prejudice against those who made money if they made good use of their money when made. They loved the poor and served the poor, but they had no objection to being served by the rich if the rich offered to share any portion of their possessions with them. They were not anarchists or socialists. They were preachers of the gospel to the poor, a gospel whose message was of equal importance

[1] 23. 50, 51.

and value to the rich and to which the rich were equally welcome if they would hear.

X. The Gospel for the Outcasts

There is still another class with which the physician must perforce come into professional contact, and with which the preacher and the lawyer often have little to do. That is the class of the social outcasts. It is surely characteristic of this Gospel according to Luke that its sympathy reaches even to these. Luke 6. 35, in the margin of the Revised Version, reads, Jesus despaired "of no man." That might be made the text of the entire narrative. Luke was like his Master again at this point. The brand of public infamy has no weight for him. His sympathies went out to all who were in need, even as the sympathies of Jesus always had been manifested most to those who needed them most.

In the Acts of Paul and Thecla we read that Paul said of Jesus that he was the only one who sympathized with a world gone astray. In the Epistle to the Hebrews

we read that Jesus is our great High Priest, being able to sympathize with the ignorant and the erring. It is this compassionate Christ whom Luke sets before us in his pages. He is not seeking the self-satisfied, but the self-despairing. It was the sickest who had greatest need. It was those whom all others had deserted who most needed a friend. Jesus in this Gospel is the Good Shepherd seeking for the outcast in the farthest mountains of social ostracism or willful sin. Jesus was a Jew. He had had a Jewish training. He lived always in a Jewish environment. He never had the advantage of foreign travel and he never came under the broadening influence of residence among the many races of men. Yet he never displays any Jewish narrowness or prejudice. He is interested in all men alike. No man, of whatever nationality or of whatever previous spiritual condition, is beyond his sympathy or the ready proffer of his help.

1. This is the Gospel in which we read of the prodigal son who wastes all his living on harlots and yet is not beyond reclama-

tion, and who comes back at last to the father's home and to the unhesitating and undiminished love of the father's heart.[1]

2. This is the Gospel of the publican Zacchæus, generally regarded as a sinner with whom no respectable people ought to have any social dealings, but with whom Jesus went to lodge, and whom Jesus acknowledged as a son of Abraham.[2]

3. This is the Gospel of the sinful woman with whom Simon the Pharisee would have been ashamed to show any personal acquaintance in public, but whom Jesus recognized and whose service he gladly accepted and whose sins he freely forgave.[3]

4. This is the Gospel in which the crucified criminal, a coarse bandit who was given up by the state as a hopeless case, and was paying the penalty of his many crimes, walked straight into paradise with the sinless Lord.[4]

In this Gospel the harlot and the criminal, the prodigal and the social pariah, of whatever class or condition, are freely of-

[1] 15. 11–32. [2] 19. 2–10. [3] 7. 36–50. [4] 23. 40–43.

fered the society and the service of the purest and the best. Do the preachers of to-day associate with these classes? Are they on terms of familiar acquaintance with them? Are they continually finding converts among them? Are they continually proving that they who are forgiven most love most, and that from these classes the most devoted saints may come? If they are not, their gospel must be somewhat different from the gospel of Luke and his Lord; or, if they have the same gospel, their ministration of it must be somewhat different.

Does not this Gospel according to Luke suggest that every Christian preacher to-day ought to know every saloon keeper in his neighborhood and every inmate of every house of ill fame, and that a part of his ministry ought to be given to these, and that some of the chief triumphs of his ministry ought to be found among these? Surely, conditions have not so changed that we need to despair of any man or of any woman now, or that we ought to recog-

nize any social outcasts now, to whom it is not our duty to carry the good news of salvation.

The Gospel according to Luke is the gospel of the children, the gospel of womanhood, the gospel of the poor, and the gospel of the outcast and forsaken. Of course, the other synoptics have some suggestions of these things, but they are so numerous in the third Gospel and they are so frequently found in the portions peculiar to it that they become characteristic of the narrative written by Luke. They might be accounted for altogether by his knowledge of and his sympathy with the character of Jesus, who was the friend of the little ones and the women and the poor and the publicans and sinners in all his ministry. They might be accounted for altogether by Luke's personal character and by his overflowing sympathy for all the helpless and oppressed. We have endeavored to show that in addition to these things his profession as a physician must have influenced him largely in his choice of materials for

his gospel history. The sign-manual of the physician is written large over the pages of his narrative and is apparent also in his peculiar and characteristic interest in certain classes—the women and children, the outcast and the poor. We might continue our classification of the general characteristics of the Gospel according to Luke under this general head, but we prefer to turn now from Luke the physician to Luke the companion of Paul.

XI. The Pauline Gospel

Much more nearly than the other two synoptics, the Gospel according to Luke is the Gospel according to Paul. It is but natural that the Gentile Gospel should reflect most largely the theology of the apostle to the Gentiles. Luke's close personal association with the apostle Paul must have influenced him greatly in his conceptions of the scope, the content, and the aim of the gospel message and truth. Paul was more nearly a systematic theologian than any other of the New Testa-

ment writers. Luke has managed to get much more doctrine into his Gospel narrative than the other synoptics; and the doctrine of Luke is substantially the doctrine of Paul.

Three times in his epistles Paul speaks of "my gospel."[1] Origen, Eusebius,[2] and Jerome[3] thought that Paul meant by this phrase the Gospel according to Luke. That was his gospel because it represented his point of view throughout. Irenæus[4] had written still earlier, "Luke, the companion of Paul, committed to writing the gospel preached by the latter." There is so much in common between the Gospel written by Luke and the gospel preached by Paul that we can readily believe that Paul's influence is manifest in Luke's writing, but we do not believe that Paul ever called the third Gospel his own in the sense that he claimed any personal responsibility for its composition. When he spoke of "my gospel" he meant only the revelation made to

[1] Rom. 2. 16; Rom. 16. 25; 2 Tim. 2. 8. [2] Ecclesiastical History, iii, 4. 8.
[3] De Viris Illustribus, vii. [4] Adversus Hæreses, iii, 1. 1.

himself and proclaimed in his preaching. We have no reason to believe that the word "gospel" was used as a proper name in any of the New Testament writings or was applied at any time to any of the books we now call by such title.

The truth behind this tradition of Paul's personal appropriation of the third Gospel is, as Plummer says, the fact that "Paul was the illuminator of Luke (Tert. iv, 2): he enlightened him as to the essential character of the gospel. Luke, as his fellow worker, would teach what the apostle taught, and would learn to give prominence to those elements in the gospel narrative of which he made most frequent use." The old Latin proverb said, *Noscitur a sociis*, "A man is known by the company he keeps." No one could be a close companion with the apostle Paul without being influenced by him in both life and thought. We have already seen that Luke was not only a companion, but a beloved physician and a congenial friend. Coleridge used to say that no one was fit to be

a commentator upon the Epistles of Paul except Martin Luther, and Luther failed because he was not such a gentleman as Paul. Now, Luke was a gentleman. He had something of the innate courtesy that characterized the great apostle, and in this Gospel we find the general impress made by the character and the creed of the apostle upon such a man.

Having thus determined the nature of Luke's indebtedness to Paul, we will now look for the more specific proofs of such relationship in the writings of these two men.

1. We notice some remarkable parallelisms of expression at several points. (1) In the account of the Lord's Supper neither Matthew nor Mark tells us that the Lord said, "Do this in remembrance of me." Luke, in 22. 19, and Paul, in 1 Cor. 11. 24, are the only ones to record it. Matthew and Mark say that the Lord said, "This is my blood of the covenant," while Paul and Luke record the words as, "This cup is the new covenant in my

blood."[1] Matthew and Mark connect the Eucharist, or thanksgiving, with the cup; Paul and Luke connect it with the bread. These striking differences from the other accounts and close similarities between Paul and Luke would be sufficient in themselves to suggest that these two men had been associated many a time in the administration of this sacrament, and had so come to adopt the same formulation in the account of it.

(2) In 1 Cor. 15. 5 Paul tells us that the risen Lord appeared to Cephas. The only other mention of this resurrection appearance in the New Testament is to be found in Luke 24. 34: "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." Paul and Luke seem to have regarded this as one of the important appearances, or at least worthy of mention in any account of them. All our other authorities are utterly silent concerning it.

(3) Some have thought that a threefold classification of ideas is characteristic of

[1] Luke 22. 20; 1 Cor. 11. 25.

both Paul and Luke. We recall such passages in the Epistles of Paul, as 1 Cor. 13. 13, "Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three," and that other enumeration of the essential elements in the unity of the Spirit set forth in Eph. 4. 4–6, falling into three groups of three: one body, one Spirit, one hope; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, transcendent, omnipresent, immanent, over all, through all, in all. When we turn to Luke we find him recording the three parables of the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son together, while Matthew has the parable of the lost sheep alone.[1] Luke tells us of three would-be disciples who are turned away by our Lord, and in the parallel passage in Matthew[2] we find mention of only two. Compare also the loaf, fish, and egg of Luke 11. 11, 12 with the bread and fish of Matt. 7. 9, 10.

(4) There are many phrases common to Paul and Luke and not to be met anywhere else in the New Testament. Long lists of

[1] 18. 12. [2] 8. 19–22.

these have been prepared by many authorities. We suggest a few samples only among them. Compare Luke 4. 22 with Col. 4. 6, and Luke 8. 15 with Col. 1. 10, 11, and Luke 6. 39 with Rom. 2. 19, and Luke 10. 8 with 1 Cor. 10. 27, and Luke 21. 36 with Eph. 6. 18.

2. To these parallelisms in expression we add, in the second place, a remarkable similarity in the use of single terms. For example:

(1) The double title "Lord Jesus" is found nearly a hundred times in the Epistles of Paul. It is found only once in the synoptic Gospels—in Luke 24. 3.

(2) The name "Lord" is applied to Jesus again and again by Paul. It is never so used in the Gospel according to Mark except by the heathen Syrophœnician woman in 7. 28. The title occurs fourteen times in Luke, and so makes another connecting link between his usage and that of Paul.

(3) The proper name "Satan" is used by Paul ten times, by Luke seven times, by

Mark six times, by Matthew four times, and by John only once.

(4) The word "Saviour" is not found in Matthew or Mark. It occurs twice in Luke, once in John, and a multitude of times in Paul.

(5) The word "salvation" is not found in Matthew or Mark. It occurs four times in Luke, once in John, on page after page in the writings of Paul.

(6) The word "grace" is characteristic of Paul's most frequent and emphatic usage. It is never found in Matthew and Mark. It occurs eight times in Luke and three times in John. It is found one hundred and forty-six times in the New Testament, but only twenty-one times outside the writings of Luke and Paul.

(7) "Faith" is another keyword in Paul's theology. It is found in Luke eleven times, in Matthew eight, in Mark five, and in John not at all. In the book of Acts the word occurs sixteen times. It is found in the New Testament two hundred and forty-three times, but only fifty-three

times outside the writings of Luke and Paul.

(8) Repentance is joined with faith in the usage of Paul as one of the essentials to salvation. The word "repentance," *μετάνοια*, is found in Luke five times, in Matthew two, in Mark only once, and in John not at all. It occurs in the book of Acts six times.

(9) Paul joins mercy with grace and peace in some of his salutations. The word "mercy," *ἔλεος*, is found in Luke six times, in Matthew three, and in Mark and John and the book of Acts not at all. To Luke all the perfection of God would seem to be summed up in his quality of mercy. In the Sermon on the Mount, as reported by Matthew, the climax of command is found in the words, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect,"[1] but Luke chronicles the corresponding command in his Sermon on the Plain in these words, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father is also merciful."[2]

[1] Matt. 5. 48. [2] 6. 36.

He who attains this height will find nothing beyond him.

We may say, in general, that Luke's vocabulary is much more Pauline than that of the other gospel writers. Luke has one hundred and one words in common with Paul which are not to be found in any other writers of the New Testament books. Matthew has only thirty-two and Mark twenty-two and John twenty-one.

3. However, it is when we come to the doctrinal features they have in common that the relationship between the writings of Luke and Paul becomes most apparent. (1) The third Gospel furnishes the historical background for just such teaching and preaching as that of the great apostle of the Gentiles, Paul. In its narrative Israel is rejected and the way is opened for the reception of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God just as clearly as in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. *a.* In the first sermon in the ministry of Jesus he made it apparent to his fellow townsmen in Nazareth that the

heathen might enjoy the blessings they were ready to despise.[1] *b.* In the middle of his ministry Jesus answers the question, "Are there few that be saved?" by declaring, "They shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God; but ye yourselves shall be cast forth without."[2] *c.* At the close of his ministry Jesus told his disciples that it was written that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations.[3] From the beginning to the end the Gentiles are included within the scope of the gospel salvation.

(2) In thorough consistency with this fundamental position we find a spirit of wide-reaching and all-inclusive tolerance characterizing this Gospel even as it did the preaching of Paul. See how this is apparent in the attitude of Jesus as pictured here toward the Samaritans. The Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans. They considered them even worse than

[1] 4. 24–27. [2] 13. 23–29. [3] 24. 47.

Gentile dogs. *a.* When the Samaritan villagers showed themselves inhospitable James and John were ready to call down fire from heaven upon them, in the spirit of Elijah. But Jesus declared that the intolerant spirit of Elijah was not the spirit of the gospel he had come to preach. That gospel would include and in due time would win the Samaritans as well as the Jews.[1] *b.* Again, when ten lepers were healed and only one returned to give thanks unto God both Jesus and the evangelist call attention to the fact that the one grateful man was a Samaritan stranger.[2] *c.* Again, in the Master's parable of the one who proved himself neighbor to the man who fell among thieves he chose as the hero of that tale no Jewish priest or Levite, but a good Samaritan.[3] It is in the third Gospel alone that we find these three references to the Samaritans, and they all breathe the same spirit of tolerance and friendliness that was to characterize a gospel preached to and for all men.

[1] 9. 52–55. [2] 17. 11–19. [3] 10. 30–37.

(3) The emphatic and persistent presentation of the personality of the Holy Spirit is characteristic of both Luke and Paul. Where Matthew reads, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"[1] Luke sums up all good things in that one greatest gift of the Father to men and says, "How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?"[2] In the third Gospel we find eighteen references to the Holy Spirit, thirteen of them in four chapters; and in the whole of Matthew there are only twelve, and in Mark only six. Luke therefore has as many as Matthew and Mark combined.

If we were to name the three features in which the doctrinal teaching of Luke and of Paul are most alike, we would mention: 1. The universal scope of the gospel, because of the marvelous grace and all-inclusive love shown by God to men. 2. The importance of

[1] Matt. 7. 11. [2] Luke 11. 13.

the work of the Holy Spirit. 3. The emphasis laid upon the real humanity of Jesus. We turn next to consider this characteristic of the Gospel according to Luke.

It is the Gospel of the real humanity of Jesus. It is the Gospel of Jesus as our Brother-Man. It is the Gospel of the Kinsman-Redeemer of the race. Here for the first time in the New Testament we meet the word "redemption"—"He hath visited and wrought redemption for his people," Zacharias sings.[1] We are told that Anna spoke of Jesus to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.[2] The two disheartened disciples on their way to Emmaus said, "We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel."[3] Redemption by a genuine incarnation—that is the great theme of this Gospel.

XII. The Gospel of Jesus, Our Brother-Man

1. *In early life.* It begins by showing that the birth and infancy and childhood

[1] 1. 68. [2] 2. 38. [3] 24. 21.

of Jesus were those of any normal human life. (1) Luke alone tells us about the poverty of the surroundings into which the baby boy came, born of a woman, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, wrapped in the swaddling clothes and laid in the stable straw.[1]

(2) Luke tells us that he was circumcised like every other Jewish boy.[2] It was the first shedding of redeeming blood. It was his first external identification with the religious life of his race.

(3) Luke also tells us about his presentation in the temple.[3] Born under the law, it became him to fulfill all righteousness.

(4) Luke records the fact that the child Jesus grew as every other child grew, increasing in size and increasing in strength, and correspondingly increasing in wisdom as the days and the years went by.[4] The boy Jesus is neither omniscient nor omnipotent, but just a normal, natural, healthy, and growing boy, according to this passage in Luke.

[1] 2. 4–7. [2] 2. 21. [3] 2. 22. [4] 2. 40.

(5) Luke tells us how Jesus went up to Jerusalem to celebrate his first passover as a son of the Law, and how he sat in the temple in the midst of the teachers, both hearing them, and asking them questions.[1]

(6) Luke adds that through all his minority in the home at Nazareth Jesus was subject to his parents, as any lad would be expected to be.[2]

(7) Then, lest anyone should think that the youth of Jesus was not like his childhood or like the youth of any other lad in its gradual development of all its powers, Luke tells us again that Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men.[3] It is Luke alone who has given us this information concerning the babe and the boy and the youth, and he has shown us that Jesus was just like us in his human birth and growth, glorifying babyhood and obedient childhood by entering fully into their estate.

2. *At the close of life.* When we turn to the close of the narrative we find that

[1] 2. 42–46. [2] 2. 51 [3] 2. 52.

Luke is very careful to show us that Jesus is very human at every point. (1) Luke tells us that when Jesus wept over Jerusalem he wept audibly, sobbing aloud in his profound grief, genuinely human and pitiful.[1] He wept at the grave of Lazarus, but there he wept silently. John has recorded that weeping,[2] but neither John nor Luke nor any other evangelist has ever recorded the fact that Jesus laughed. He was a "man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief"; but he must have had some moments of relaxation. We feel sure that he must have smiled many and many a time, and it would be strange indeed if there were not occasions when he was provoked into hearty laughter. He entered so thoroughly into sympathy with the joys as well as the sorrows of those who were his friends that he must have laughed with them sometimes. The picture of normal boyhood which Luke presents in this Gospel would be incomplete if we were not allowed to imagine in it cer-

[1] 19. 41–44. [2] John 11. 35.

tain moments of unrestrained merriment in the enjoyment of innocent fun. We think that he would have been more likely to pipe and dance and laugh with the other children of Nazareth in their games in the market place than to join in any funeral performances or mock mourning. His youth was a happy one, but he became a Man of sorrows, and as he treads the thorny path to the cross with suffering and tears Luke shows us that he was very man at every step.

(2) Luke records that an angel appeared to him in Gethsemane, strengthening him.[1] Truly man, he needed heavenly aid.

(3) Luke alone tells us of the extremity of human weakness and physical agony through which Jesus passed in Gethsemane, in which "his sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground."[2]

(4) Luke alone tells us that in that Gethsemane arrest Jesus called himself again by his favorite title by means of

[1] 22. 43. [2] 22. 44.

which he so continually identified himself with the human race and proclaimed his brotherhood with all other men, for he said, "Judas, betrayest thou *the Son of man* with a kiss?"[1]

(5) Luke has the record that in utter human dependence upon the Father in the hour and article of death he said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."[2]

(6) Luke alone tells us that the centurion who stood by and saw him suffer and die was so impressed that "he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was *a righteous man*."[3]

(7) Luke tells us that after his resurrection, in the appearance to the assembled disciples on that first Easter eve, Jesus sought to convince them that his incarnate humanity had survived death and the grave, and that his human identity was unimpaired. He said to them, "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having."

[1] 22. 48. [2] 23. 46. [3] 23. 47.

Then he took a piece of broiled fish "and ate before them."[1] As at the beginning of his life, so at the close of his life, Luke insists upon the Lord's real humanity. There is no human weakness or limitation in which Jesus does not share. He is one with us in everything but sin; and he was one with us after the resurrection and in the ascension as well.

In his birth and early life Luke has shown us that the Lord was really and truly man. Through the closing days and in his death Luke has made it equally clear that Jesus was genuinely human to the last. How about the years of his active ministry? To us there is no better proof of the real and genuine humanity of Jesus than his prayers afford us; and no one of the evangelists has emphasized the Lord's need and practice of prayer as Luke has. Through all his ministry he shows us the man Jesus continually exercising the grace of true spiritual dependence. Luke repeatedly tells us that Jesus was praying

[1] 24. 39–43.

when the other evangelists say nothing about it.

3. *In the life of prayer.* (1) We read in the other Gospels about the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan, but Luke alone tells us that it was as Jesus was being baptized *and praying* that the heaven was opened for the descent of the Holy Spirit and the witness of the heavenly Voice.[1]

(2) We read in some of the other Gospels about the cleansing of the leper and the immediately succeeding collision with the religious authorities. Luke only tells us that between these two events Jesus withdrew himself into the deserts *and prayed*.[2]

(3) We read in the other Gospels of the choice of the twelve. Luke tells us that that choice was made in the early morning, after Jesus had continued *in prayer all night long* upon the mountain alone.[3]

(4) Luke tells us that it was after Jesus had been *praying apart* that Peter made the great confession, and Jesus answered it

[1] 3. 21. [2] 5. 16. [3] 6. 12, 13.

with his first prediction of his own future suffering and certain murder.[1]

(5) Others tell us about the transfiguration experience, but Luke alone informs us that Jesus had gone up into that mountain *to pray*, and that *as he was praying* the fashion of his countenance was altered, and he was transfigured before the disciples' eyes.[2]

(6) Matthew records the prayer prescribed for the disciples, "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name," as a part of the Sermon on the Mount. Luke alone tells us that that Prayer was first given when Jesus had been *praying in a certain place*, and when he ceased one of his disciples had asked him, Lord, wilt thou teach us to pray ?[3]

(7) Luke tells us that Jesus said to Peter, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: but I *made supplication for thee*, that thy faith fail not."[4]

(8) Luke records that Jesus prayed on

[1] 9. 18–22. [2] 9. 28, 29. [3] 11. 1–4. [4] 22. 31, 32.

the cross, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."[1]

(9) Luke adds that Jesus made his last breath a breath of prayer. He cried with a loud voice, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost."[2]

Jesus needed to pray just as much as we need to pray. He prayed to God for strength because he needed strength. He prayed to God for guidance because he needed guidance. He prayed to God for knowledge because he needed enlightenment. He prayed for miracle-working power, and it was granted him in answer to his holy prayer. He asked for the Holy Spirit, and by his aid he lived a holy life. He is our perfect Pattern in prayer. He is our Prince of faith. Luke has emphasized this fact as no other New Testament writer has. We are not surprised, therefore, that he not only has given us the example of Jesus in the practice of the prayer life, but he also has preserved for us some

[1] 23. 34. [2] 23. 46.

additional instructions given by Jesus concerning prayer.

(1) Luke alone tells us that Jesus spoke a parable to the end that men ought always to pray and not to faint.[1]

(2) He tells us that Jesus in that parable declared that the elect of God cry to him day and night.[2]

(3) Luke alone gives us those three prayer parables of Jesus, the importunate friend,[3] the importunate widow,[4] and the pompously praying Pharisee and the piously praying publican.[5] They all teach by contrast. You do not need to pray like the importunate friend, for you pray to a Father in heaven who is not asleep in bed and who is more ready to give than you are to ask. You do not need to behave like that importunate widow, for you do not pray to an unjust judge, but to a loving Father who will avenge you speedily. You must not pray like that self-announcing Pharisee, but like the self-denouncing and self-renouncing publican.

[1] 18. 1. [2] 18. 7. [3] 11. 5–9. [4] 18. 1–8. [5] 18. 9–14.

(4) Matthew 25. 13 and Mark 13. 33 tell us that the Lord exhorted the disciples to "watch" in view of the coming perils and trials of the church; but Luke adds "at every season, *making supplication*, that ye may prevail."[1]

(5) Luke alone tells us that when they had come to the garden of Gethsemane Jesus exhorted the disciple band, "*Pray* that ye enter not into temptation."[2] It was only after having given this final warning and command that he went on into his own spiritual wrestling and final victory through prayer.

If the disciples of Jesus had learned to pray as their Master prayed, their victory would have been as sure and as continuous as his own. He was their Master in the practice and the precept of prayer, as in everything else. Luke recognizes him as such. That title "Master," ἐπιστάτης, is peculiar to Luke in the New Testament. He alone records the fact that the disciples gave this name to Jesus; and in the third Gospel we find it seven times.[3]

[1] 21. 36. [2] 22. 40. [3] 5. 5; 8. 24; 8. 45; 9. 33; 9. 49; 17. 13.

4. *In social life.* It is characteristic of the third Gospel that it pictures Jesus as entering into all the social relations of life. Much more frequently than the other evangelists Luke tells us how Jesus was entertained in private homes, was invited to dinners, and sat at meat with various hosts and sometimes with many guests; and much of the teaching which Matthew represents Jesus as giving in public discourses we find Luke recording in connection with these social events.

(1) Luke tells us that a certain Simon, a Pharisee, invited Jesus to eat with him, but neglected to show him the usual courtesies offered to guests, and when Jesus was anointed by the sinful woman Simon was told the parable of the two debtors, and was thus gently rebuked.[1]

(2) Luke tells us of the reception in the house of Martha and Mary, and of Martha's ministration to the bodily needs of the company while Mary ministered to the Master's wearied soul.[2]

[1] 7. 36–50. [2] 10. 38–42.

(3) Luke tells us how another Pharisee asked Jesus to dine with him, and while they were sitting at the table Jesus uttered that scathing rebuke of Pharisaical hypocrisy and sin.[1] Evidently Jesus did not consider the acceptance of any man's hospitality a sufficient reason for blinking any man's sin.

(4) Luke alone tells us that on a certain Sabbath Jesus was dining in the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees, and it was there that the cure of the dropsical man took place.[2] When he saw those who were bidden choosing the chief seats he rebuked their selfishness.[3] He told his host that he ought not to invite such people to dinner, but he would be blessed if he would invite only the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind.[4] Then he spoke the parable of the great supper, the invitation to which was slighted by the guests first bidden, and to which the people filling the highways and the hedges were constrained to come.[5]

[1] 11. 37–52. [2] 14. 1–6. [3] 14. 7–11. [4] 14. 12–14. [5] 14. 15–24.

(5) By Luke only we are told of the joyful hospitality given to Jesus in the home of Zacchæus and the glad issue in salvation to that house.[1]

(6) By Luke alone we are told of his breaking bread in the home of the two disciples at Emmaus, and of their recognition of him in the familiar manner of his doing it.[2] The table manners of Jesus must have been well known in many a humble home in Palestine.

In all the instances we have mentioned Luke alone has preserved the picture of the entertainment of Jesus by private persons in their homes. We learn from these narratives that Jesus did not refuse an invitation to dinner upon the Sabbath day, but, on the contrary, on that day and every day he seems to have accepted without hesitation the proffered hospitality of rich and poor, of friends and foes. We learn, too, that he was just as faithful to his ministry on these social occasions as he was in the synagogues or at any other

[1] 19. 6–9. [2] 24. 30, 31.

place. People had their sins forgiven while he sat at dinner. Salvation came to the home in which he was entertained. Some of his most stinging rebukes were administered to those who sat at meat with him. Some of his most precious parables and teachings were first given on these social occasions.

(7) In the parables peculiar to the third Gospel there are many glimpses of home life, showing how our Lord had been observant of many domestic experiences. The master of the house who rises up and shuts to the door and makes all safe for the night, the neighbor who comes knocking loudly at midnight and asking to borrow a few loaves of bread, the woman raising a great dust and upsetting the whole house until she finds the lost coin, the great banquet with music and dancing to celebrate the prodigal's return—all these things Luke lets us know that the Lord had seen and had made note of for use in his preaching. In the parable of the mustard seed Mark says that the seed was sown in the

earth,[1] and Matthew says in the field,[2] but Luke says that a man sowed it in his own garden.[3]

XIII. The Gospel of Praise

We close this list of the characteristics of the third Gospel by noting some of the things that recall the personality of the author with his sunny disposition that made him beloved by all and caused his praise to be sung in all the churches.

1. The narrative begins and it ends with worship in the temple. The first picture we see is that of the multitude of the people praying at the hour of incense,[4] and the last picture shown us is that of the band of disciples, spending their time continually in the temple praising God.[5]

2. The first chapters are filled with hymns of praise. We find there the Magnificat, the song of Mary[6]; the Benedictus, the song of Zacharias[7]; the Ave Maria, the angel's salutation[8]; the Gloria in Excelsis, the song of the angels[9]; and the Nunc

[1] 4. 31. [2] 13. 31. [3] 13. 19. [4] 1. 10. [5] 24. 53.
[6] 1. 46–55. [7] 1. 68–79. [8] 1. 28–33. [9] 2. 14.

Dimittis, the song of Simeon.[1] Schaff says of these: "They are the last of Hebrew psalms, as well as the first of Christian hymns. They can be literally translated back into the Hebrew without losing their beauty."[2]

They evidently belong to just this border line between the two dispensations. They are much more like the ancient psalms than the later Christian hymns are wont to be. They have just enough of the dawning light of the new order to distinguish them from the songs written before the Dayspring from on high had visited God's people. The Jewish forms and figures are used to express a new hope and a new joy. The promise made to Abraham is fulfilled. It is the house of David which is to be blessed. It is the glory of the house of Israel which is revealed. But redemption is wrought; salvation has come; the day has dawned; the whole heaven is lit up with hope; the whole heart is filled with peace. These are Christian hymns,

[1] 2. 29–32. [2] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 665.

but there is an indefiniteness about them that marks them as belonging to the very beginning. There is no redemption by blood. There is no forecasting of the cross. These things came in later. They do not belong here in the first joy that light has shined upon those who sat in darkness and the shadow of death.

This Gospel begins with songs and ends with songs, and there is singing and rejoicing all the way along. The Gospel according to Matthew began with the wailing at Bethlehem for the children who were no more and it ended with sevenfold "Woes" upon the Pharisees who would not be saved. In the Gospel according to Luke the saints are singing from the beginning to the close. Bishop Alexander said of the Magnificat: "It is the highest specimen of the subtle influence of the song of purity, so exquisitely described by Browning. It is the Pippa Passes among the liturgies of the world."[1] What he has said of Mary's song we might well say of the entire Gos-

[1] Alexander, The Leading Ideas of the Gospels, p. 114.

pel. It is a message whose melody has transformed the hearts of men.

3. More often than in any other Gospel we are told that those who received special benefits glorified God for them. Matthew and Mark note this fact occasionally, but Luke notes it again and again.[1] Plummer calls our attention further to the fact that the expression "praising God"[2] is almost peculiar to Luke in the New Testament. The phrase "blessing God" found in Luke 1. 64; 2. 28 occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in James 3. 9. The phrase, "to give praise to God," is found only in Luke 18. 43.

4. In the two books of Matthew and Mark the noun "joy" occurs seven times, while in Luke and Acts it is found thirteen times. In Matthew and Mark the verb "to rejoice" occurs eight times, while in Luke and Acts it is found nineteen times. Do not these facts suggest that Luke was about twice as joyful as the ordinary man, and that he was praising God and glorify-

---

[1] 2. 20; 5. 25, 26; 7. 16; 13. 13; 17. 15; 18. 43.
[2] 2. 13; 2. 20; 19. 37; 24. 53; and Acts 2. 47; 3. 8; 3. 9.

ing God so continually that it seemed to him to be the natural thing to do?

5. The ministry of angels to Jesus and to the disciples is emphasized more frequently in the third Gospel than in any of the others; and angels are mentioned twenty-two times in the book of Acts. The angel Gabriel stands at the entrance to this Gospel, as the messenger of God to both Zacharias and Mary, foretelling the birth of both John the Forerunner and Jesus the Messiah. An angel appears to the shepherds with the good news of the Saviour's birth and then a whole choir of the heavenly host sing for great joy. At the time of the great confession Jesus promised that the Son of man would come "in his own glory, and the glory of the Father, and of the holy angels."[1] He told his disciples, "Every one who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God."[2]

[1] 9. 26. [2] 12. 8, 9.

He told the disciples about the woman who found the lost coin and then added, "Even so, I say into you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.[1] He declared that those who attain to the resurrection from the dead are equal to the angels, and die no more.[2] In the wilderness of temptation the devil quoted the promise of the psalm to Jesus: "He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, to guard thee,"[3] and in the garden of agony that promise was fulfilled, for Luke records that "there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him."[4] However, the passage is of somewhat doubtful authenticity. As the Virgin had had her angelic vision in the beginning, so the holy women have their vision of angels at the tomb.[5] Here and there throughout the Gospel we hear echoes of angel songs and catch glimpses of angel wings. The whole narrative is brightened with their presence and their praise.

[1] 15. 10. [2] 20. 36. [3] 4. 10. [4] 22. 43. [5] 24. 23.

XIV. The Gospel and the Man Luke

Our knowledge of the man helps us in our study of the Gospel, for we find that the characteristics of the man are the characteristics of the book. Some men may have the power of concealing their own personality in their writings, as Shakespeare had. We can learn little or nothing about Shakespeare himself by reading his plays. Most men, however, write their own characters into the productions of their pen. Charles Lamb put his own genial disposition into the Essays of Elia. Thomas Carlyle put his own crabbed self into his pamphlets and criticisms and histories and prophecies. As we read them we know what sort of a man wrote them. They are self-revealing. Carlyle could not write another man's biography without writing his autobiography between the lines. No more could Luke. He writes the biography of the Perfect Life, but he writes it out of a heart in perfect sympathy with that transcendent Life.

He has a most beautiful subject with which to deal, but the subject alone would never have enabled him to make the most beautiful book ever written. That Life Beautiful had to be written into a Book Beautiful by a soul beautiful as they.

Therefore we shall never cease to be thankful that, although many others had taken in hand to write a narrative of these matters before him, Luke felt constrained to say, "It seemed good to me also, most excellent Theophilus, to write these things for thee accurately and in order." The personality revealed in that phrase, "me also," finds explicit mention in that first sentence of preface and dedication alone; but the influence of that personality is apparent to all who have eyes to see, and who will take the trouble to look for it, in every following page of the Gospel. Dante called Luke "the writer of the story of the gentleness of Christ,"[1] and only a gentle and lovable spirit could have written a story so beautiful in style and in content as this.

[1] De Monarchia, i, 16.

Date Due

FACULTY			
JAN 3 0 '57			

BS2595 .4.H41
The most beautiful book ever written:
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00013 6616